



Bauhng, Victor Jongjin (2012) *Early Sīra material and the Battle Of Badr*. MPhil thesis, SOAS (School of Oriental and African Studies)

<http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/13187>

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this thesis, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", name of the School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

# EARLY SĪRA MATERIAL AND THE BATTLE OF BADR

VICTOR JONGJIN BAUHNG

Thesis submitted for the degree of MPhil in History

2011

Department of History  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of London

**Declaration for MPhil thesis**

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: Victor T. Banbury

Date: June 22, 2011

## ABSTRACT

The *sīra* material of Ibn Ishāq, al-Wāqidī and that ascribed to Mūsā b. ‘Uqba for the Battle of Badr is greatly similar in content. At the same time, distinguishing features of the material reveal the various ways in which it was constructed and utilized. Through word-for-word and thematic analyses of the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī, it is discovered that while the bulk of the material is identical, it nonetheless underwent modifications and reconstructions, sometimes out of the hagiographic impetus to idealize the figure of Muḥammad. It is also discovered that al-Wāqidī certainly drew from without citing Ibn Ishāq, as both versions in a number of locations are exactly parallel. Also in both versions of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī were found pro-‘Abbāsīd bias and storytelling material. A comparison between the material of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā reveals that a significant amount of the main outlines of the Badr story is the same, and many of the corresponding traditions between the two versions include the same components. Be that as it may, the storyline diverges at times, and some divergences result in considerably different understandings of the Badr story. At least one of the traditions was not reliably transmitted by Ibn Ishāq who instead performed edits to the tradition. Also at least one of the reports within the Mūsā-account is erroneous. Since the Battle of Badr in any standard biography of Muḥammad includes the main outlines contained in the work of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā, the discrepancies discovered raise legitimate questions concerning the accuracy of the story.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER 1—Ibn Ishāq and Alteration	
Part 1.....	52
Part 2.....	67
CHAPTER 2—Al-Wāqidī and Dependence.....	101
CHAPTER 3—Mūsā b. ‘Uqba and Differentiation	
Part 1.....	136
Part 2.....	153
CONCLUSION.....	182
WORKS CITED.....	185

## INTRODUCTION

Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767), al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) and Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (d. 141/758) are reported to be early biographers of Muḥammad. For this study, the Battle of Badr is the focus, and each of the following chapters is an analysis of a biographer’s material or the material that has been ascribed to him. The issue of main concern for each chapter is to do with 1) changes made to the material of Ibn Ishāq; 2) al-Wāqidī’s dependence upon Ibn Ishāq, and; 3) differences between the material of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā.

## Alteration of Ibn Ishāq’s Material

*Ibn Ishāq and his Material in Later Recensions*

The full name of the first of the traditionists is Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Yasār b. Khiyār.<sup>1</sup> It is said that he composed a biography of the Prophet, or the *Sīra*.<sup>2</sup> It is also said that the book was written at the request of the caliph al-Manṣūr (r. 136/754-158/775).<sup>3</sup> Although the book is not extant, modern scholars put forth that it was composed of three sections: 1) *mubtada’*, pre-Islamic history; 2) *mab’ath*, the activities of Muḥammad in Mecca; and 3) *maghāzī*, the Prophet’s career in Medina.<sup>4</sup> This judgment is based upon analyses of the existing data, i.e. Ibn Ishāq’s material found in the recensions of his students and later authors. Johann Fück in his dissertation has listed

<sup>1</sup> According to some sources, b. Khabbār, or Kūmān, or Kūtān. *EF*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “Ibn Ishāq.”

<sup>2</sup> Abū al-Faraj Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Gustav Flügel (Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1871-72), 1:92-93. Concerning the *sīra*, Ibn al-Nadīm reported, “The errors in genealogy presented in his book and derived from the Jews and Christians, whom he called in his book ‘People of the First Knowledge’ and ‘Possessors of Tradition,’ weakened and falsified his writing.”

<sup>3</sup> Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh Baghdād aw madīnat al-salām* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī, 1931), 1:221.

<sup>4</sup> Horowitz argues that Ibn Ishāq’s material did not originate at the time of al-Manṣūr but much earlier: “That Ibn Ishāq wrote his *Kitāb al-maghāzī* for the caliph . . . cannot anyhow mean that he composed it on a commission from the caliph. The list of authorities cited by him, of itself, shows that he had composed his material principally on the basis of the traditions collected by him in Medina . . .” Josef Horowitz, *The Earliest Biographies of the Prophet and their Authors*, ed. Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2002), 79. See also Abbott who asserts, “Manṣūr commissioned the gifted scholar to *extend* his work to cover the time from Adam to the author’s own day, that is, to *add* to it still another part, namely, the *Ta’rīkh al-khulafā’*.” Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 1:90.

fifteen students of Ibn Ishāq (The towns are those at which the students are said to have heard Ibn Ishāq's lectures):<sup>5</sup>

1. Ibrāhīm b. Sa'd (110/728-184/800) in Medina
2. Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'ī (d. 183/799) in Kufa
3. 'Abd Allāh b. Idrīs al-Awdī (115/733-192/808) in Kufa
4. Yūnus b. Bukayr (d. 199/814-5) in Kufa
5. 'Abd b. Sulaymān (d. 187-88/804) in Kufa
6. 'Abd Allāh b. Numayr (115/733-199/815) in Kufa
7. Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Umawī (114/732-194/810) in Baghdad
8. Jarīr b. Kāzīm (85/704-170/787) in Basra
9. Hārūn b. 'Īsā
10. Salama b. al-Faḍl al-Abrash (d. 191/807) in Rayy
11. 'Alī b. Mujāhid in Rayy (d. 180/796)
12. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mukhtār in Rayy
13. Sa'īd b. Bazī
14. 'Uthmān b. Sāj
15. Muḥammad b. Salama al-Harrānī (d. 191/807)

Nabia Abbott reports three additional students:<sup>6</sup>

16. Abū Yūsuf (113/731-182/798), pupil and friend of Abū Ḥanīfa and favorite of Mahdī and Hārūn al-Rashīd
17. The Kufan Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan al-'Awfī (d. 201/817 or 202/817)
18. Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Umawī

Of the eighteen students, three have been paid particular attention in modern scholarship, due mainly to an availability of material attributed to them for study: 1) Al-Bakkā'ī; 2) Salama b. al-Faḍl; and 3) Yūnus b. Bukayr.

The first of the three figures, the Kufan Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'ī, had a mediocre reputation among traditionists.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless al-Bakkā'ī is reported to have directly received from Ibn Ishāq recitations of his material on two occasions.<sup>8</sup> Based upon this report, R. G. Khoury considers al-Bakkā'ī's recension to be the most accurate

<sup>5</sup> Johann Fück, "Muḥammad Ibn Ishāq. Literarhistorische Untersuchungen," (Phil. diss., Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1925), 44.

<sup>6</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 1:92-93. Abbott states, "It is not to be expected that all of the eighteen pupils were similarly or equally motivated." She suggests the grouping of Ibn Ishāq's pupils in three ascending categories: 1) The largest group was content with merely *hearing* the master; 2) The second group may have had professional objectives but did not begin by hearing the master in person; 3) The pupils of the third group started by hearing the master but proceeded further to produce written copies either from the master's own dictation or from authenticated written sources.

<sup>7</sup> Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, ed. Yūsuf b. al-Zakī 'Abd al-Raḥmān Mizzī and 'Abd al-Ghanī b. 'Abd al-Wāḥid Jammā'īlī (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 3:375-77; Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-i'tidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*, ed. 'A. M. al-Bajāwī (Beirut, 1963), 2:91-92.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 3:376.

among Ibn Ishāq's students.<sup>9</sup> Rizwi Faizer also regards the recension of al-Bakkāī to be accurate, but her estimation is drawn from her analysis of the Ibn Ishāq-material concerning Muḥammad's treatment of the Jews in Medina.<sup>10</sup>

Al-Bakkāī transmitted his master's material to the Egyptian (originally Basran) Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833), whose extant *sīra* contains a substantial portion of the work of Ibn Ishāq. Ibn Hishām limited the scope of his writing to the life of the Prophet and ancient Arabia. Significantly, he made alterations to the material he received. The omissions he undertook are described by him in the preface to his book:

[I omitted] some of what Ibn Ishāq recorded in this book, including what was not told about the Prophet, about which the Qur'ān was not revealed, and things from this book which lacked reason, explanation and evidence. Regarding the omissions, I did not record poems that he reported which no person of authority on poetry whom I had met knew about, things that are disgraceful to discuss, matters that would distress certain people to mention, and things that al-Bakkāī did not establish for me as trustworthy in his *riwāya*.<sup>11</sup>

Other alterations by Ibn Hishām were the addition of narratives, poetry,<sup>12</sup> genealogical data, and explanations of difficult words and expressions.<sup>13</sup> Fück observed that when making additions to the text of Ibn Ishāq, Ibn Hishām provided his own indications, allowing the reader to distinguish his additions from the words of Ibn Ishāq.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> R. G. Khoury, "Les sources islamiques de la 'Sīra' avant Ibn Hishām (m. 213/834) et leur valeur historique," in *La vie du prophète Mahomet*, ed. Toufic Fahd (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1983), 10.

<sup>10</sup> Rizwi S. Faizer, "Muhammad and the Medinan Jews: A Comparison of the Texts of Ibn Ishaq's *Kitāb Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* with al-Waqidi's *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28 (1996): 463. In another publication, Faizer shows that al-Ṭabarī faithfully recorded Ibn Ishāq's words seeing as the former made clear his disagreements with the latter with insertions of his own opinion: "It is undeniable that there are differences between the interpretations of Ibn Ishāq and al-Ṭabarī . . . as for instance regarding the agreement between Muḥammad and the Jews." Rizwi S. Faizer, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī Revisited: A Case Study of Muḥammad and the Jews in Biographical Literature," (Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 1995), 4-5.

<sup>11</sup> 'Abd al-Malik b. Hishām, *Al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī (Cairo: Maktabat wa-Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1955), 1:4.

<sup>12</sup> It is said that Ibn Hishām wrote a book explaining the difficult words in the poetry found in the *sīra*. Alfred Guillaume, introduction to *The Life of Muḥammad: A Translation of Ishāq's Sīrat Rasūl Allāh with Introduction and Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), xlii-xliii.

<sup>13</sup> Guillaume states, "Occasionally he is helpful with genealogical notes; more rarely he has something useful to say about the interpretation of a line in Ibn Ishāq's work." *Ibid.*, xli.

<sup>14</sup> Fück, "Muḥammad Ibn Ishāq," 36.

The work of Salama b. al-Faḍl, the second of the three figures, is extant in both the *Tafsīr* and *Taʾrīkh* of al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923).<sup>15</sup> In the *Tafsīr*, Salama's Ibn Ishāq-material is found in the exegesis of individual Qur'ānic verses. In al-Ṭabarī's *Taʾrīkh*, the material is scattered throughout and is equipped with the *isnād* Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama—Ibn Ishāq. The *sīra* material in the *Taʾrīkh* is part of a universal history which begins at the earliest history, climaxes during the life of Muḥammad, and ends with the accounts of the subsequent caliphs. Included in this chronicle is the history of the kings of Persia.<sup>16</sup> Notably, the *Taʾrīkh* includes two stories by Ibn Ishāq that have been omitted from the recension of Ibn Hishām: Muḥammad's intended suicide<sup>17</sup> and the “satanic verses.”<sup>18</sup>

It is said that a *qādī* of Rayy, Ibn Saʿd, reported Salama's transmission of the *maghāzī*.<sup>19</sup> It is also said that Salama produced the most complete book of the *maghāzī*.<sup>20</sup> Other reports indicate that Salama's version of the *maghāzī* is identical to that of Ibn Ishāq. In one such report, Salama claimed to have heard the *maghāzī* twice from his master through *samʿ* (lecture).<sup>21</sup> According to a different report, the *qarāṭīs* (scrolls) from which Ibn Ishāq wrote his *Kitāb al-kabīr* for the caliph were inherited by Salama.<sup>22</sup> Some modern scholars regard the work of Salama as the most accurate transmission of the words of Ibn Ishāq. Gordon Newby asserts, “From him [Salama] we have the most

<sup>15</sup> For a list of al-Ṭabarī's works including the *Taʾrīkh* and *Tafsīr*, see Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 1:234.

<sup>16</sup> Another work that includes the history of the kings of Persia is al-Dīnawarī's *Al-Akḥbār al-ṭiwāl*. Of the work, Bernhard Lewin says, “History is seen from an Iranian point of view; thus the Prophet is mentioned so to speak in a marginal note of the history of Anūsharwān; Islam and the Arabs appear on the scene when invading Persia; the Umayyads are treated with only as far as the religious and political movements involving the eastern part of Islam are concerned . . . This tendency towards promoting Iranian views may be due, not to anti-Arab feelings, but to the sources on which he drew.” *EP*, s.v. “Al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Ahmad b. Dāwūd.”

<sup>17</sup> Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1879-1901), 1:1147.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 1192-96.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:104. In the report, Salama also transmits the *mubtadaʿ*.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 103-4; al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān*, 2:192.

<sup>21</sup> Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān*, 2:192.

<sup>22</sup> Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh al-Baghdād*, 1:221.

reliable transmission of the original *Sīrah*.”<sup>23</sup> Abbott also writes of the preference to be awarded to Salama’s work:

Salamah’s transmission was preferred to that of any other because of his possession of the originals. Ṭabarī both confirms and supplements the biographers in such a way as to make it abundantly clear not only that Salamah definitely transmitted the *Ta’rīkh* along with the rest of Ibn Ishāq’s works, but that his transmission was the one consistently used by Ṭabarī himself.<sup>24</sup>

Salama transmitted to Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-Rāzī (d. 256/869), or Ibn Ḥumayd,<sup>25</sup> who was the most prominent transmitter to and teacher of al-Ṭabarī. Another figure from whom al-Ṭabarī reportedly received Ibn Ishāq’s material for the assembling of his *Ta’rīkh* is Aḥmad b. Ḥammād al-Dūlābī (d. post 256/869).<sup>26</sup>

That the Ibn Ishāq-material between the texts of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Hishām is the same is asserted by Ismail Poonawala, who translated al-Ṭabarī’s work on the last years of Muḥammad’s life: “Despite a number of variants and some minor additions and omissions, it is worth noting that, on the whole, there is remarkable agreement between the two *riwāyahs*.”<sup>27</sup> If Poonawala’s observation is correct concerning the latter years of the Prophet’s life, then it seems logical that the Badr story in the texts of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Hishām is also similar or identical. Thus the analysis in chapter 1 involves a comparison of the Ibn Ishāq-material between the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī for the Battle of Badr. In light of the absence of an authoritative written text by Ibn Ishāq, a high degree of identicalness discovered may be sufficient for the Ibn

<sup>23</sup> See Gordon Darnell Newby, *The Making of the Last Prophet: A Reconstruction of the Earliest Biography of Muḥammad* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 1-8.

<sup>24</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 1:94.

<sup>25</sup> Otherwise known as Muḥammad b. Ḥamīd. Ibn Ḥumayd was a scholar of Rayy who was regarded highly by Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Ḥanbal. Abbott, *Studies*, 1:94; Khoury, “Les Sources Islamiques,” 20.

<sup>26</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 1:94. However Rosenthal asserts that a reference in the work of Yāqūt in which Ibn Kāmil credits Aḥmad b. Ḥammād as the teacher of Ibn Ishāq’s *mubtada’*- and *maghāzī*-material for al-Ṭabarī “is no doubt a mistake.” Rosenthal reasons that the reference “could hardly have occurred in Ibn Kāmil’s original text but must have crept in during the course of transmission.” Franz Rosenthal, *General Introduction and From Creation to the Flood*, vol. 1, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 18.

<sup>27</sup> Ismail K. Poonawala, introduction to *The Last Years of the Prophet*, vol. 9, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), xi. Donner also asserts that the material of Ibn Ishāq in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī is “virtually the same.” Fred Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1997), 132.

Ishāq-material to be utilized in comparisons with the work of al-Wāqidī (chap. 2) and that attributed to Mūsā (chap. 3). It is to be noted that although sufficient, the Ibn Ishāq-material may not be as faultless as a written text by Ibn Ishāq, and any shortcomings from the comparisons may be attributable to this difference.

The work of Yūnus b. Bukayr,<sup>28</sup> the third of the three figures, is not utilized for the analysis in chapter 1, for it possesses a mere few sentences on the Battle of Badr. In its entirety, the extant text of Ibn Bukayr, which is found in the work of the Kufan Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-‘Uṭāridī (177/794-272/886), is approximately one-fifth the size of the recension of Ibn Hishām.<sup>29</sup> Although the analysis does not involve the work of Ibn Bukayr, some comments concerning his work are relevant to the study of the Ibn-Ishāq-material.

According to a report, Ibn Bukayr described the manner in which Ibn Ishāq transmitted his traditions: “All of Ibn Ishāq’s reports are supported (*musnad*), for he dictated them to me, or read them before me, or related them to me.”<sup>30</sup> It is also said that Ibn Bukayr took the text of Ibn Ishāq and knitted it together with other traditions.<sup>31</sup> This is affirmed by Miklos Muranyi who observes that “Ibn Bukayr had not merely written down the material of Ibn Ishāq but had incorporated other traditions which did not belong to the Ibn Ishāq corpus.”<sup>32</sup> Sadun Mahmud al-Samuk also detects the presence of traditions other than those of Ibn Ishāq in the recension of al-‘Uṭāridī.<sup>33</sup> Suhayl Zakkār’s explanation for the differences in al-‘Uṭāridī envisions that Ibn Bukayr’s recension was written by Ibn Ishāq prior to his transfer to Baghdad. In

<sup>28</sup> Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (Leiden: Brill, 1967-2000), 1:289.

<sup>29</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ishāq, *Kitāb al-siyar wa-l-maghāzī, recension of Yūnus b. Bukayr*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1978).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>31</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 11:435.

<sup>32</sup> Miklos Muranyi, “Ibn Ishāq’s Kitāb al-Maghāzī in der Riwaya von Yūnus b. Bukayr. Bemerkungen zur frühen Überlieferungsgeschichte” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 14 (1991), 216-18.

<sup>33</sup> Sadun Mahmud al-Samuk, “Die historischen Überlieferungen nach Ibn Ishāq. Eine synoptische Untersuchung.” (Phil. diss., Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, 1978), 82-83, quoted in Faizer, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī Revisited,” 49.

addition, Zakkār notices that the recension of al-‘Uṭāridī is more pro-‘Alī than the recensions of Ibn Hishām and Salama, both of which he believes were composed later at the ‘Abbāsīd court and were edited to the satisfaction of the caliph.<sup>34</sup> Another difference in the recension of al-‘Uṭāridī is its inclusion of traditions that were omitted from the text of Ibn Hishām. According to Wim Raven, Ibn Hishām would have frowned upon some of the Ibn Ishāq material in al-‘Uṭāridī’s recension.<sup>35</sup>

Although an aim in chapter 1 is determining the level of identicalness of the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī, the chapter’s main objective has to do with the variants between the recensions. A student of Ibn Ishāq or a later transmitter may have made changes to the material he received, and these changes would be reflected in the textual variants. The study’s concern is not with inadvertent alterations, but with identifying changes that were made intentionally.<sup>36</sup> A transmitter may have felt the need to make minor adjustments such as grammatical improvements or elucidatory modifications. Major changes may have involved reconstructions of the narrative performed out of doctrinal or other concerns.

### *The Doctrine of ‘Iṣma*

The doctrine of ‘*iṣma* (immunity from error and sin), which originated in the second Islamic century, gave rise to alterations in the Muslim traditions.<sup>37</sup> According to Uri Rubin, traditions about Muḥammad that did not conform to the evolving perception of him as the immaculate prophet and the most perfect man on earth were denied wide

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibn Ishāq, *Kitāb al-siyar*, 13.

<sup>35</sup> *EQ*, s.v. “Sīra and the Qur’ān.”

<sup>36</sup> Examples of inadvertent alterations are the variation in the sequence of words, the substitution of synonyms, and errors that arose from faulty hearing, i.e., errors due to the confusion over words having the same pronunciation as others but differing in spelling.

<sup>37</sup> Wilferd Madelung writes concerning the doctrine: “In early Islam moral failures and errors of Muḥammad were freely mentioned, although there was an inconsistent tendency to minimize the shortcomings of the Prophet and in particular to deny that he had ever participated in the worship of idols.” *EI*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “‘*iṣma*.”

circulation, especially in the canonical *muṣannaḥ* collections of *ḥadīth*.<sup>38</sup> For instance, the version of the satanic verses story in which Satan possessed temporary control over Muḥammad failed to gain access into any of the *muṣannaḥ* compilations due to dogmatic concerns by the compilers.<sup>39</sup> Other instances are the story of Muḥammad's intended suicide<sup>40</sup> and Muḥammad's sacrifice to idols, of which Rubin states:

While the story was originally intended to describe the transition from idolatry to monotheism that Muḥammad experienced with Zayd's guidance, Muslim scholars eventually became sensitive to all kinds of unflattering dogmatic implications which could be deduced from the innocent stories. Above all, one could note the fact that before the transition to monotheism took place, Muḥammad was an idolater like everyone else in Mecca. This idea could not be tolerated by Muslim scholars for whom the *ʿiṣma* of the Prophet should mean total and eternal immunity from paganism, preventing him from committing sins during every moment of his life, even before he became a prophet.

Rubin argues that a change in the story occurred that shifted the sinful sacrificial act from Muḥammad to an unspecified person, leaving the Prophet immune from idolatry.<sup>41</sup> Thus the story was altered out of the hagiographic concern to idealize the figure of Muḥammad.

#### *Oral and Written Transmission*

A related issue to the alteration of the Muslim traditions is oral and/or written transmission. Scholars debate when the traditions began to be written down and the manner by which they were passed on from teacher to student.

That oral and written transmission went hand in hand from the start is a view held by Abbott. From her study in the sciences of the tradition (*ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*), she

---

<sup>38</sup> Rubin continues, "As it was these collections, more than other types of literary compilations, which served as the venue for the authoritative formulation of an Islamic sense of spiritual and legal identity in Umayyad and early ʿAbbāsīd times, the on-going process of selection represented by these collections was of crucial importance. Themes, motifs, and ideals rejected by these collections did not become part of mainstream Islamic thinking." Uri Rubin, *The Eye of the Beholder: The Life of Muḥammad as Viewed by the Early Muslims—a Textual Analysis* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1995), 224-25.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 163.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

<sup>41</sup> Rubin comments, "The art of story-telling has thus given way to the art of academic manipulations." *Ibid.*, 80.

argues that the traditions of Muḥammad as transmitted by his Companions and the subsequent Successors were scrupulously scrutinized at each step of the transmission.<sup>42</sup> She considers the Companions Anas b. Mālik (d. 91/709-93/711), ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ (d. 42/663), Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687-8), and Abū Hurayyah (d. 62/681) to have been prolific writers whose collections gained currency as early as the second half of the first Islamic century. These men were “determined and insatiable collectors, redactors, and transmitters of the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah*.”<sup>43</sup> Abbott provides the names of other collectors and the reports thereof which describe their collecting activity:

Among this group was ‘Amr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣārī (d. 51 or 53/671 or 673), who started his collection of the *sunnah* and *ḥadīth* with the written instructions on alms, blood money, inheritance, and other topics that he received from Muḥammad at the time of his appointment in the year 10/631 to Najrān to instruct the people and collect the alms tax. There was also Abū al-Yassar Ka‘b ibn ‘Amr (d. 55/675), whose servant accompanied him carrying his manuscripts and whose materials were written down by others. Again, there was the judge and traditionist Masrūq ibn al-Ajda‘ (d. 63/682), who is said to have been adopted by ‘Ā’ishah and who traveled widely in search of *‘ilm*, which he wrote down. One may mention, finally, the Yemenite ‘Amr ibn Maimūm al-Awdī (d. 74/693), who, though he was converted during Muḥammad’s lifetime, did not actually meet Muḥammad but made numerous pilgrimages and transmitted from ‘Umar, ‘Alī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd, and others. He settled in Kūfah and wrote on historical subjects, and Ibn Ishāq of *Sīrah* fame drew freely from his works.<sup>44</sup>

From her descriptions, it is clear that Abbott regards the relevant Muslim traditional literature as historical.

According to Abbott, followers of Muḥammad of the second and third generations sought and used the *ḥadīths* for personal and spiritual edification, religious learning and exhortation, and the furtherance of personal ambitions and the improvement of their social standing. These uses of the tradition brought about the development and growth of the science of *ḥadīth*. Abbott envisions that the science of

---

<sup>42</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 2:2.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

*ḥadīth* started at an early age due to an interest not only in law but also in Qur'ānic sciences, particularly Qur'ānic readings (*qirā'āt*) and commentary.<sup>45</sup>

Schoeler rejects this linear development of religious instruction which originated with the Prophet and developed into the later system of *ḥadīth* transmission. For Schoeler, the system of *ḥadīth* transmission was introduced in the last third of the first/seventh century beginning with systematic collections by scholars such as 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712).<sup>46</sup> Schoeler accepts the conclusion reached by G. H. A. Juynboll who argues for the emergence of the use of *isnāds* during the second Islamic civil war (61/680-73/692).<sup>47</sup> Possibly Jewish converts familiar with the system of authentication employed in the Talmud introduced the system into Islamic transmission. More likely for Schoeler however was the existence of a parallel development in both cultures.<sup>48</sup> Schoeler explains that the Muslim, faced with the non-existence or unrecognized authority of written sources in a community, needed to "authenticate" and "support" (*asnada*) his material whose origin was to be demonstrated by mentioning an oral source, that is, his authority.<sup>49</sup>

Around this time, an aversion to the writing down of traditions is said to have existed.<sup>50</sup> In view of the aversion, 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr reportedly burned his recordings, i.e., notes used as mnemonic aids, and possibly lecture notebooks.<sup>51</sup> The only writings of 'Urwa that have survived are his *rasā'il* (letters) to the caliph 'Abd al-Malik (r. 65/685-

<sup>45</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 2:12. Abbott argues against the view among some Western scholars that interest in Muslim tradition was first stimulated by members of the legal profession.

<sup>46</sup> Gregor Schoeler, "The Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam Revisited," in *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, ed. James E. Montgomery (New York: Routledge, 2006), 61. For Schoeler's previous endorsement of the linear development of religious instruction, see his *Charakter und Authentie der muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Mohammeds* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 27-28.

<sup>47</sup> G. H. A. Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 17-23.

<sup>48</sup> Horovitz argued that the *isnād* was modeled upon the practice of the Jewish schools in the Talmudic (Amoraean) era. Josef Horovitz, "Alter und Ursprung des Isnād," *Der Islam* 8 (1918): 46.

<sup>49</sup> Gregor Schoeler, "Oral Torah and Ḥadīth: Transmission, Prohibition of Writing, Redaction," in Schoeler, *Oral and the Written*, 113.

<sup>50</sup> Chase Robinson describes the aversion for recording as a "fairly fierce polemic against writing," in his *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 24.

<sup>51</sup> Schoeler, *Charakter*, 53.

86/705) who had requested from ‘Urwa certain information concerning the life of the Prophet.<sup>52</sup> It is debatable however whether these extant *rasā’il* are in their original or edited form. Robinson’s estimation of ‘Urwa is that he is to be considered as nothing more than a transmitter of traditions: “[T]here is no reason to doubt that figures such as ‘Urwa existed, and that they took some interest in the past, circulating stores and (perhaps) even teaching about it. There is less reason to think they exercised any authority as authors (rather than storytellers), much less as recognizable historians.”<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, Schoeler points out that the title “founder of historical study in Islam” is awarded to ‘Urwa by other Western scholars.<sup>54</sup>

The aversion to the recording of traditions is said to have come to an end in the next generation. The Umayyad caliph Sulaymān (r. 96/715-99/717) is reported to have commissioned Abān b. ‘Uthmān (d. between 96/714 and 105/723-24) to write down the reports about the life (*siyar*) and campaigns (*maghāzī*) of the Prophet. The caliph then had ten scribes copy and write down Abān’s material on parchment.<sup>55</sup> In another report, the following caliph ‘Umar II (r. 99/717-101/720) ordered Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad b. Ḥazm (d. 120/738) to compile the first official codification (*tadwīn*) of *ḥadīths*.<sup>56</sup> ‘Umar II is said to have feared the “disappearance of tradition and the extinction of its carriers.” It was Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) however who is reported to have been the first to undertake and complete the codification project: “The first to have collected and

<sup>52</sup> The alleged letters are found in al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 1:1181 and 1284-88.

<sup>53</sup> Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 24. Schoeler says, “It is out of the question that ‘Urwa wrote a *K. al-Maghāzī* in the sense of a definitively edited book (*syngamma*), as rather late sources allege.” *Et*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr.” The composition by ‘Urwa was held by Jarrar: “That ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr composed a work on ‘maghāzī’ is no longer to be disputed.” Maher Jarrar, *Die Prophetenbiographie im Islamischen Spanien. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989), 20.

<sup>54</sup> *Et*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr.”

<sup>55</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, *Al-Akhbār al-muwaffaqiyāt*, ed. Sāmī Makkī al-‘Ānī (Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-‘Ānī, 1972), 332.

<sup>56</sup> Muḥammad b. Sa‘d, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr. Biographien Muḥammeds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230*, ed. Eduard Sachau (Leiden: Brill, 1904-40), 2:134.

written down the knowledge is Ibn Shihāb.”<sup>57</sup> According to Schoeler, al-Zuhrī’s collection was likely undertaken or finished after the death of ‘Umar II (101/720).<sup>58</sup>

Al-Zuhrī is said to have had reservations about recording *ḥadīths* early in his career: “We had an aversion to the writing of knowledge until these rulers compelled us to do it. Now we have the opinion that we should not prohibit any Muslim [from doing so].”<sup>59</sup> Al-Zuhrī would later become settled in his acceptance of recording traditions: “The rulers had me write it [the tradition] down. Then, I made them [the princes under the caliph Hishām (r. 105/724-125/743)] write it down. Now that they have written it down, I am ashamed before God not to write it down for others.”<sup>60</sup> Al-Zuhrī’s acceptance of the writing of *ḥadīths* is attested in another report: “Had it not been for the *ḥadīth* reaching us from the East [i.e. ‘Irāq], with which we are not acquainted and which we reject, I would neither have recorded *ḥadīths* nor would have permitted others to do so.”<sup>61</sup> Here al-Zuhrī’s acceptance had to do with maintaining the purity of the traditions.

Schoeler estimates that al-Zuhrī’s work was not more than a kind of orderly collection of historical *ḥadīths*. Schoeler also maintains that al-Zuhrī created the first definitive framework for the biography of Muḥammad.<sup>62</sup> Al-Zuhrī received this framework, according to Fred Donner, from authorities such as ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, and ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utba. Al-Zuhrī’s work is not extant,

<sup>57</sup> Yūsuf b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Barr, *Jāmi‘ bayān al-‘ilm wa-faḍlihi wa-mā yanbaghi fī riwāyatihi wa-ḥamlihi*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān (Al-Madīnah al-Mudawwarah: Al-Maktabah al-Sulfiyah, 1968), 1:88, 91; Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’ ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā’* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1967), 3:363; cf. Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:280.

<sup>58</sup> Schoeler, “Oral Torah and Ḥadīṭ,” 124. Schoeler points out that the report in which ‘Umar requested al-Zuhrī to make copies of the completed collection in order to distribute them to various provinces is most likely inauthentic and probably based upon the story of ‘Uthmān’s distribution of the standardized Qur’ān. The report is found in Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Jāmi‘ bayān*, 1:91-92.

<sup>59</sup> ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣan‘ānī, *Al-Muṣannaḥ*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān A‘zamī (Beirut: Tawzī‘ al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983), 11:258, no. 20486.

<sup>60</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Jāmi‘ bayān*, 1:92.

<sup>61</sup> Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb taqyīd al-‘ilm*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. Y. al-‘Ush (Beirut, 1975), 108, quoted in Schoeler, “Oral Torah and Ḥadīṭ,” 124.

<sup>62</sup> Schoeler, *Charakter*, 37.

but many of its excerpts are said to be present in later sources.<sup>63</sup> Goldziher pointed out that al-Zuhrī occasionally bowed to Umayyad pressure and sanctioned traditions that were advantageous to the rulers.<sup>64</sup>

In the following generation, the writing down of traditions was the norm.<sup>65</sup> Jonathan Bloom elucidates, “The Umayyad caliphs had encouraged some kinds of literature, notably hadith and poetry, but with the rise of the Abbasid caliphate in the middle of the eighth century, books and book knowledge became a general aim of Islamic society.”<sup>66</sup> No longer were papyrus (*qirtās*) and parchment (*raqq*), materials rare and costly for production and dissemination, the principal materials for writing, but techniques for the manufacturing of paper were introduced in the Near East by Chinese prisoners captured at the battle of Aṭlakh (near Tālās) and taken to Samarqand in 134/751.<sup>67</sup> According to Shawkat Toorawa, the arrival of the technologies of paper and its principal consequence, books, had profound influences on the production of learned and literary culture, on the modes of transmission of learning, and on the nature and types of literary production.<sup>68</sup> It is at the beginning of this generation that Ibn Ishāq is reported to have written his book about the Prophet.

---

<sup>63</sup> See A. A. Duri, “Al-Zuhrī: A Study of the Beginnings of History Writing in Islam,” *BSOAS* 9, no. 1 (1957): 1-12.

<sup>64</sup> Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, trans. and ed. S. M. Stern and C. R. Barber (London: Allen and Unwin, 1971), 2:46. Goldziher stated, “[T]he Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation ḥadīths which seemed to them desirable, and . . . people of the type of the pious al-Zuhrī acquiesced in being their tools—though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency.”

<sup>65</sup> In a report in which Hishām b. ‘Urwa denied that Ibn Ishāq made visits to his wife, Hishām asserts, “The people of Medina consider writing as permissible.” Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:42.

<sup>66</sup> Jonathan Bloom, *Paper before Print: The History and Impact of Paper in the Islamic World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 111. In his book, Bloom provides an extensive overview of the development of Islamic writing including the introduction of paper in and the spread of papermaking across the Muslim world. See also the historiographical work by Robinson, who makes a modern-day analogy of the centrality of writing: “Writing came to be as crucial to Islamic learning as it is to any other high cultural tradition, its instruments fetishized nearly as much as laptop computers and mobile phones amongst businessmen today.” Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 173.

<sup>67</sup> Gregor Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: from the Aural to the Read*, rev. ed., trans. Shawkat Toorawa (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 99.

<sup>68</sup> Shawkat Toorawa, introduction to *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr and Arabic Writerly Culture: A Ninth-Century Bookman in Baghdad* (London: Routledge, 2005), 2.

Schoeler argues that Ibn Ishāq's *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was part of an emerging genre of structured works (*muṣannafāt*). These structured works were divided by chapters and were of an intermediate kind between *syngammata* (literary works composed and redacted according to the canon of stylistic rules; authorized editions or actual books) and *hypomnēmata* (private written records intended as a mnemonic aid for a lecture or conversation).<sup>69</sup> Schoeler also argues that the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was not meant for public or lay circles. Instead the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, described as “literature of the school for the school,” was used for the purpose of giving oral lectures for a close circle of students in the royal courts. This unique manner in which the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was utilized is the explanation Schoeler offers for the question in modern scholarship of why the book has not survived today.<sup>70</sup> A related question is what to make of *maghāzī* traditions that go back to Ibn Ishāq but do not form part of his *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. In response, Schoeler offers the possibility that Ibn Ishāq simply reported *ḥadīths* about the Prophet that were not included in his *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. Schoeler further states that the new mode of transmission via publication by no means pushed out the old method of oral lecture. As confirmation, he alludes to a report by Ibn Sa‘d in which Ibn Ishāq upon the completion of his book continued to conduct lectures in the areas of Kufa, al-Hira, and Rayy.<sup>71</sup>

Schoeler asserts that the institution of academic lecture courses that was practiced in antiquity, e.g., the transmission of Aristotle’s works through lectures, was familiar to Muslims and known as *sam‘* (audition).<sup>72</sup> In this form of teaching, the

<sup>69</sup> Gregor Schoeler, “The Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” in Schoeler, *Oral and the Written*, 43. Other compilations considered by Schoeler to be for the most part “literature of the school for the school” are those of al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Ṭabarī and Abū al-Faraj.

<sup>70</sup> Schoeler, *Charakter*, 54. Nyberg, commenting on the work of Ibn al-Kalbī, asserted that although the book was lost, the material within survived due to their extensive use. H. S. Nyberg, “Bemerkungen zum ‘Buch der Götzenbilder’ von Ibn al-Kalbī,” in *Dragma Martino P. Nilsson Dedicatum*, 2, (Lund: Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae, 1939), 349.

<sup>71</sup> Yāqūt b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥamawī, *Irshād al-arīb ilā ma‘rifat al-adīb*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth (London, 1923-31), 6:399.

<sup>72</sup> Schoeler, “Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” 30. According to Schoeler, heard/audited/aural tradition (*al-riwāya l-masmū‘a*) is “inaccurately translated as ‘oral tradition.’ The phrase contains an important distinction: it emphasizes the fact that a student has *heard* the material (rather than merely copied it). Whether the teacher lectured from written records or memory or whether

students listened to the recitation of a teacher or his representative who utilized written notes or spoke from memory. More frequent of the two was the use of written notes. The other form of teaching practiced by the Muslims was *qirā'a* (recitation), later also known as *'arḍ* (presentation). During *'arḍ*, the student recited from memory or read from his written notes while the teacher listened and made corrections.<sup>73</sup> According to Schoeler, these two forms of teaching were capable of reliably and authentically disseminating knowledge.<sup>74</sup> When the student was capable of reciting verbatim the words of his master, he was entitled to an *ijāza* (authorization, license) which gave the student the certification to transmit and teach the material to others. The material was often in the form of a text or whole book that was either authored by the master or received by the master through a chain of transmitters that went back to the first transmitter or the author. The *ijāza* was usually written in the student's notebook.<sup>75</sup>

According to Schoeler, the master sometimes presented his material in different ways. The differences in the performances gave rise to differences in the students' recensions. These variations would be observable in the texts today. Another explanation for the variations is that the "[s]tudents either took notes during the lecture or, if they in turn wanted to transmit further the material received in a lecture, afterwards produced a written version from memory or from somebody else's records."<sup>76</sup> The most drastic explanation which Schoeler offers is that the students possibly incorporated deletions, additions, tendentious revisions, and may even have engaged in tampering and outright forgeries.<sup>77</sup> Thus in the case of Ibn Ishāq's *Kitāb al-*

---

the student wrote down his notes simultaneously or committed the material to memory first is an issue of much less importance which, at the very least, is not expressed in the terminology." Ibid., 41.

<sup>73</sup> Schoeler notes, "These 'lectures' were held in *majālis* or *mujālasāt* (sessions) and *ḥalaqāt* (circles), which in earlier times often took place in mosques, sometimes also in other places, for example, a scholar's home." Schoeler, "Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?" 41.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>75</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 1:94; *EF*, s.v. "idjāza."

<sup>76</sup> Schoeler, "Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?" 40.

<sup>77</sup> Schoeler, "Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam Revisited," 45.

*maghāzī*, Schoeler asserts that the existence of its divergent recensions is unsurprising, even though the author himself had given his material a fixed shape.<sup>78</sup>

It was a study by al-Samuk of the different transmissions of Ibn Ishāq that discovered the presence of substantial variants, including those between the versions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī. The discovery led al-Samuk to conclude not only that a reconstruction of Ibn Ishāq’s original work was not possible, but also that Ibn Ishāq never composed a book of any finished shape. According to al-Samuk, the transmission of Ibn Ishāq’s material was purely oral through lectures, and Ibn Ishāq’s students and later authors who preserved the material shaped it according to their religious and political biases.<sup>79</sup>

#### *The Works and Biases of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī*

One author who is known to have omitted reports out of political bias is Ibn Hishām. These reports which have to do with the capture, imprisonment and ransom of al-‘Abbās in effect encompass his entire involvement at Badr.<sup>80</sup> Ibn Hishām’s pro-‘Abbās bias also led him to interpolate the conversion of al-‘Abbās to Islam.<sup>81</sup> This issue of pro-‘Abbās bias may not be limited to the figure of Ibn Hishām. The bias may have also affected the writing of Ibn Ishāq (explored in chapter 3) and that of al-Wāqidī (explored in chapter 2).

<sup>78</sup> Schoeler, “Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” 34.

<sup>79</sup> Al-Samuk, “Die historischen Überlieferungen,” 159-65, quoted in Harald Motzki, “The Author and his Work in the Islamic Literature,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003): 174. Wansbrough went further by doubting that works ascribed to Ibn Ishāq and other writers of the second Islamic century were in reality composed by them. John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977). Norman Calder argued similarly for some legal works in his *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993). However, Motzki in the case of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf* argues that ‘Abd al-Razzāq is indeed the author. Harald Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>80</sup> Horovitz compared the editorial work of Ibn Ishāq with that of Ibn Hishām and al-Wāqidī: “Even if Ibn Ishāq introduced traditions complimentary of the caliph, he did not do so to the degree of Ibn Hishām and al-Wāqidī, both of whom omitted al-‘Abbās’ involvement against the Prophet at Badr.” Horovitz, *Earliest Biographies*, 80-82.

<sup>81</sup> Guillaume notes that the conversion is not found in al-Ṭabarī’s quotation from Ibn Ishāq. Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, 309.

Ibn Hishām wrote during the third/ninth century, a time in which works no longer contained essential changes and were considered “fixed.” Thus Ibn Hishām composed a “fixed” text which was transmitted by his students.<sup>82</sup> In the late nineteenth century, a textual critical edition of Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra* was produced by Wüstenfeld, who kept account of the variations in the twenty codices utilized for his edition.<sup>83</sup> With the identification and removal of transcription errors, the edition was a scholarly attempt at reconstructing the original words of Ibn Hishām.<sup>84</sup> For the analysis of the Ibn Ishāq-material in chapter 1, the more recent critical edition of Ibn Hishām’s work by Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī and ‘Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī is utilized.<sup>85</sup> The sources employed for their edition include the work by Wüstenfeld.<sup>86</sup>

In Ibn Hishām’s day, the simple copying of notebooks—*wijādah*, *kitābah*, etc.—may have been the norm, but a transmission was regarded as inferior if the text was not “heard” from an authority.<sup>87</sup> This idea prevailed into the time of al-Ṭabarī. Schoeler says of al-Ṭabarī and authors like him:<sup>88</sup>

Manuscripts of books by previous authors, which they had at their disposal and quoted and copied from (transmitting their material by way of *wijādah*, *kitābah*, etc.), played a relatively minor role in terms of quantity and importance. Much more important and numerous were traditions which the compilers had derived directly from the lectures of their informants, be it through their own or other students’ notes or through copying their *shaykh*’s records or a copy thereof.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>82</sup> See Schoeler, *Charakter*, 51-52.

<sup>83</sup> ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hishām, *Das Leben Muhammed’s nach Muhammed Ibn Ishāk bearbeitet von Abd el-Malik Ibn Hishām*, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1858-60). The variations are found in the “critical annotations” of *ibid.*, 2:1-219. For the twenty codices utilized and their descriptions, see the introduction to *ibid.*, xlviii-lv.

<sup>84</sup> According to Schoeler, the variations are typical of those which generate as a result of written transmission. Schoeler, *Charakter*, 53.

<sup>85</sup> ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hishām, *Al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and ‘Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī, 2 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat wa-Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1955).

<sup>86</sup> For the seven other sources utilized for this edition, see the introduction to *ibid.*, 1:23-24.

<sup>87</sup> Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:61-62, 69; 2:29.

<sup>88</sup> The other authors are al-Bukhārī, Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī and Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī.

<sup>89</sup> Schoeler, “Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” 37-38. On a related note, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal accused Ibn Ishāq of not receiving traditions in the appropriate oral manner. He complained that Ibn Ishāq would take the recordings of others and insert them in his books. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:43.

Al-Ṭabarī received his sources in various ways. C. E. Bosworth puts forth that al-Ṭabarī's variety of approaches is indicated by his use of different formulae. Formulae such as *ḥaddathanā*, *akhbaranā* or *kataba* meant that he possessed the *ijāza* for the book from which the report was quoted. An introduction with *qāla*, *dhakara*, *rawā* or *ḥuddithu* meant his reliance on older books for which he had no firm transmission tradition on which he could rely.<sup>90</sup> That the transmission to al-Ṭabarī from Ibn Sa'd in al-Ṭabarī's *Ta'rikh* was sometimes oral is argued by Ghada Osman. Osman bases his conclusion not only on the differences in the *isnāds* but also on the numerous discrepancies in wording, structure and details between the two accounts.<sup>91</sup>

Concerning bias in the work of al-Ṭabarī, Hugh Kennedy provides a general comment on his material for the early 'Abbāsīd period: "As a whole, the work is not 'biased' in any simple way, it is only pro-'Abbāsīd in the sense that it is not hostile to the dynasty, but it is limited by the limitations of its sources and each section and layer has to be treated individually and on its own merits."<sup>92</sup> More specifically, Sebastian Günther's study of a Shī'ī source (that of al-Nawfalī) used by al-Ṭabarī and Abū al-Faraj discovers that while Abū al-Faraj explicitly emphasizes Shī'ī themes, al-Ṭabarī quotes only that information dealing with the history of the 'Abbāsīd dynasty in a more general way. Günther surmises that the difference was due to "al-Ṭabarī's life-long efforts to protect himself from animosities and allegations (especially from the Ḥanbalīs) that he was a Shī'ī."<sup>93</sup> Al-Nawfalī's work being radically Imāmī would have been highly problematic for al-Ṭabarī.

<sup>90</sup> *Et*, s.v. "Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ḍjafar Muḥammad b. Ḍjarīr b. Yazīd."

<sup>91</sup> Ghada Osman, "Oral vs. Written Transmission: The Case of Ṭabarī and Ibn Sa'd," *Arabica* 48, no. 1 (2001): 80. Osman notices that while al-Ṭabarī was using Ibn Ishāq as his foremost source, he appears to have been referring to Ibn Sa'd as a source for supplementary material to augment and/or contrast Ibn Ishāq's account. Thus although al-Ṭabarī quoted at length long and numerous passages from Ibn Sa'd, he omitted a great many of Ibn Sa'd's accounts. *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>92</sup> Hugh Kennedy, "The Sources of al-Ṭabarī's History of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate," in *Al-Ṭabarī: A Medieval Muslim Historian and his Work*, ed. Hugh Kennedy (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2008), 185.

<sup>93</sup> Sebastian Günther, "Al-Nawfalī's Lost History: a Shī'ī Source Used by al-Ṭabarī and Abū l-Faraj," in Kennedy, 172.

According to Ralph-Johannes Lilie, the text of al-Ṭabarī was less influenced by the criterion of objectivity than by political considerations. In his comparative study of the texts of al-Ṭabarī and Theophanes, Lilie contends that they on occasion were dependent upon “sources that did not intend to depict the events objectively, but contained tendentiously reworked material. Probably they wanted to cast either a positive or a negative light upon their respective protagonists.”<sup>94</sup> For Lilie, historiography formed a valuable medium for imperial self-portrayal, but Theophanes and al-Ṭabarī are not to blame for the tendentiousness within their texts, for they were heavily dependent on the source material they found and were hardly capable of checking and correcting the sources in each single case, even if they had intended to do so.<sup>95</sup>

Thus included in the objective of chapter 1 is ascertaining whether the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī was affected by political pressures. For al-Ṭabarī’s recension, the analysis makes use of the textual critical edition of his *Ta’rīkh*, which was brought into publication in three series by M. J. de Goeje towards the latter part of the nineteenth century.<sup>96</sup> In addition to the twelve manuscripts utilized, de Goeje made use of the work of Ibn al-Athīr in the task of reconstructing the words of al-Ṭabarī.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Ralph-Johannes Lilie, “Theophanes and al-Ṭabarī on the Arab Invasions of Byzantium,” in Kennedy, 229.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 235. In another study of tendentiousness in the work of al-Ṭabarī, Matthew Gordon finds that hostile information against the Turks was wielded by al-Ṭabarī largely to condemn the Turks for their conduct within the Islamic community. Matthew Gordon, “The Samarran Turkish Community in the *Ta’rīkh* of al-Ṭabarī,” in Kennedy, 260.

<sup>96</sup> Abū Ja’far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, 15 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1879-1901).

<sup>97</sup> The manuscripts utilized for the edition are listed in the introduction to *ibid.*, 15:xli.

### Al-Wāqidī's Dependence upon Ibn Ishāq

Explored in chapter 2 is the material of al-Wāqidī from his *Kitāb al-maghāzī*.<sup>98</sup> The analysis involving al-Wāqidī is the logical next step in the order of the overall study seeing as it employs the same detailed method of the preceding chapter.

#### *The Views of Wellhausen, Horovitz and Jones*

The issue of greatest debate within modern scholarship concerning al-Wāqidī is whether he drew from without citing Ibn Ishāq. As early as 1882, Julius Wellhausen charged al-Wāqidī with doing so in the introduction to his abridged translation of al-Wāqidī's *Maghāzī*. According to Wellhausen, the work of al-Wāqidī was unintelligible and sense of it could only be made by referring to his predecessor. Wellhausen maintained that al-Wāqidī, though he never named Ibn Ishāq as an authority, adopted his main narrative and out of it manufactured his own narrative (er . . . seine Einschläge macht), which he supplemented with other traditions he had collected.<sup>99</sup> For Wellhausen, al-Wāqidī himself possibly modified some of the narrative.

Shortly after Wellhausen, Josef Horovitz argued similarly in his thesis and put forward ten instances in which the source of al-Wāqidī was the text of Ibn Ishāq, although Ibn Ishāq was never cited.<sup>100</sup>

In a more recent publication, J. M. B. Jones argues against the claim that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq.<sup>101</sup> His analysis of the two events in the Prophet's biography—the raid on Nakhla and the vision of 'Ātika—that Wellhausen had examined, leads him to conclude that al-Wāqidī drew from other than Ibn Ishāq. A significant

<sup>98</sup> Ibn al-Nadīm reported that the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was one of many books written by al-Wāqidī. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* 1:98-99.

<sup>99</sup> Julius Wellhausen, introduction to *Muhammad in Medina* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1882), 12-13. For his translation, Wellhausen relied on the manuscript B.M. Or. 1617.

<sup>100</sup> Josef Horovitz, *De Wāqidīi libro qui Kitāb al Maḡāzī inscribitur* (Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1898).

<sup>101</sup> J. M. B. Jones, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī: The Dream of 'Ātika and the Raid to Nakhla in Relation to the Charge of Plagiarism," *BSOAS* 22, no. 3 (1959): 41-51.

reason for Jones's conclusion is the existence of a high number of variants between the versions of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī. According to Jones, the high number of variants calls into question the dependence of one version upon the other. The variants to which he refers include synonyms, the presence or absence of particles (including prepositions and pronouns), and alterations in word sequence.<sup>102</sup> Jones also observes that al-Wāqidī's style—"the jerkiness, the short, broken sentences, the quick change of person without identifying the speaker and the apparent ellipses"—is more complex in comparison with Ibn Ishāq's basic presentation,<sup>103</sup> which displays an innovatory and individualistic style. Thus the two versions display a contrast in style and thematic presentation and cannot be related. For Jones, both Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī drew upon a common corpus of *qāṣṣ* and traditional material which they arranged according to their own concepts and to which they added their own researches.<sup>104</sup>

### *Storyteller Material*

The *qāṣṣ* (storyteller), pl. *quṣṣāṣ*, to whom Jones refers was not defined by any one activity.<sup>105</sup> His activities may have been as basic as commentating on the Qur'ān or delivering sermons. Popular among the masses, he may have mixed in with his sermons Judeo-Christian legends, stories from the *jāhiliyya*, and apocryphal and marvelous tales.<sup>106</sup> In the most general terms, the *qāṣṣ* was a popular storyteller or preacher who

<sup>102</sup> Duri also maintains al-Wāqidī's independence from Ibn Ishāq based upon the difference in their approach. A. A. Duri, *The Rise of Historical Writing Among the Arabs*, trans. and ed. Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 39. Duri reasons that during the time of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, "historical ḥadīth materials were the property of the school of Medina and so were at the disposal of both men."

<sup>103</sup> Jones, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī," 45.

<sup>104</sup> "It is very probable that both Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī had recourse to a common fund of Prophetic and historical traditions." Jones, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī," 51. See also J. M. B. Jones, "The Maghāzī Literature," in *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, ed. A. F. L. Beeston et. al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 349.

<sup>105</sup> *Et*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. "qāṣṣ."

<sup>106</sup> Hans von Mzik pointed out the common motifs between the story of 'Ātika's vision and the Biblical story of Gideon. He argued that the Muslim community needed to depict their prophet in the manner of his predecessors. Such *ḥadīths* were first told as entertainment by storytellers but later entered the stock of accredited, historical stories. Hans von Mzik, "Die Gideon-Saul-Legende und die Überlieferung der

sought to edify or enliven his hearers. He would accordingly have made embellishments and flourishes to his narrative in order to capture and hold their attention. It is this general definition which is relevant to the present study, for one of the aims in the examination of the material of al-Wāqidī is to identify embellishments made by the raconteur. As Guillaume makes clear, storyteller material is identifiable by its Goldilocks structure with its repetition of the same words and the same answer again and again. He says that such stories are the “stock-in-trade of the Arabian *qāṣṣ* and the storyteller all the world over and invariably lead up to the climax which it is the speaker’s intention to withhold until he has his audience on tiptoe.”<sup>107</sup> While chapter 2 focuses on identifying *qāṣṣ* material in the work of al-Wāqidī, an exploration of *qāṣṣ* material as it relates to the work of Ibn Ishāq is undertaken in chapter 3.

The storytellers are accepted by Abbott as having their role in the Muslim community. She places their appearance in the second half of the first Islamic century and points out that Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, while governor of Syria, formalized their position and the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān confirmed them as officially appointed *quṣṣāṣ* in the mosque services, though not without being accused of religious innovation (*bid‘a*).<sup>108</sup> For Abbott, though *qāṣṣ* material may have entered the texts of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, the texts nonetheless contain data that reliably go back to the time of the Prophet.

#### *The Views of Abbott, Crone and Cook*

Abbott thinks that al-Wāqidī drew from without citing Ibn Ishāq. Thus she argues against the view of Jones, pointing out that his analysis is based upon the study

---

Schlacht bei Badr. Ein Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte des Islāms,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 29 (1915): 371-83.

<sup>107</sup> Guillaume, introduction to *Life of Muḥammad*, xxiv. As an example of *qāṣṣ*, Guillaume points to the narrative of Muḥammad’s arrival in Medina and the invitation of one clan after another, always declined with the same words. *Al-Sīra*, 1:494-95.

<sup>108</sup> Abbott, *Studies*, 2:14-15.

of too little material. According to Abbott, an examination of a larger section of material in the works of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī will lead to the opposite conclusion. Abbott also criticizes Jones's usage of the phenomenon of variants between Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī as the grounds for maintaining the presence of dissimilar versions. She asserts that the "absence of literal parallels in the extant abridged version of the *Sīrah* . . . does not preclude Wāqidī's use of the original text of the *Sīrah*."<sup>109</sup> Hence Abbott argues that the presence of non-literal parallels may be proof of dependence.

That al-Wāqidī was not dependent upon Ibn Ishāq is held by Patricia Crone. She makes clear her agreement with Jones that a reservoir of storytelling material existed from where Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī drew and compiled their biography of the Prophet:

Wāqidī did not plagiarize Ibn Ishāq, but he did not offer an independent version of the Prophet's life, either: what he, Ibn Ishāq and others put together were simply so many selections from a common pool of *qāṣṣ* material. And it is for the same reason that they came to agree on the historicity of events that never took place . . .<sup>110</sup>

Crone also argues that the storytellers did not add their fables to any sound historical tradition; they created the traditions themselves. She maintains that as storyteller followed upon storyteller, the "recollection of the past was reduced to a common stock of stories, themes, and motifs that could be combined and recombined in a profusion of apparently factual accounts. Each combination and recombination would generate new details, and as spurious information accumulated, genuine information would be lost."<sup>111</sup> As a result, early Muslim scholars such as Ibn Ishāq and Wāqidī relied on the tales of storytellers, and their reliance on the same repertoire of tales ensured the similarity of their reports. Overall however, the material lacked a sense of harmony: "[T]he Muslim tradition was the outcome, not of a slow crystallization, but of an explosion; the first compilers were not redactors, but collectors of debris whose works

<sup>109</sup> Nabia Abbott, review of *The Kitāb al-maghāzī of al-Wāqidī*, by Marsden Jones, *The American Historical Review* 73 (Feb 1968): 865.

<sup>110</sup> Patricia Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 225.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 226.

are strikingly devoid of overall unity.”<sup>112</sup> For Crone, the earliest compilations were “mere piles of disparate traditions reflecting no one personality, school, time or place.”<sup>113</sup> And embedded within the disharmonious compilations was storytelling material as well as conflicting legal and doctrinal accounts.

According to Crone, the storytellers were responsible for an increasing precision of detail between the works of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī: “It is obvious that if one storyteller should happen to mention a raid, the next storyteller would know the date of this raid, while the third would know everything that an audience might wish to hear about it.”<sup>114</sup> In her assessment of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, she asserts:

Wāqidī . . . will always give precise dates, locations, names, where Ibn Ishāq has none . . . But given that this information was all unknown to Ibn Ishāq, its value is doubtful in the extreme. And if spurious information accumulated at this rate in the two generations between Ibn Ishāq and Wāqidī, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that even more must have accumulated in the three generations between the Prophet and Ibn Ishāq.<sup>115</sup>

Thus according to Crone, the manufacturing began as early as the first Islamic century and continued to the time of al-Wāqidī. More recently, Gerald Hawting draws attention to the increase in material between Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī for the story of the conquest of Mecca: “If we compare Ibn Ishāq’s material in the *Sīra* with that of al-Wāqidī in his *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, it is . . . notable how the ‘sanctuary material’ in the account of the conquest of Mecca has increased.”<sup>116</sup> Hawting argues that the increase not only raises the question of the correct context for the material but also indicates

---

<sup>112</sup> Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 13. Cf. Humphreys who asserts that the crystallization occurred late: “The Arabic narrative sources represent a rather late crystallization of a fluid oral tradition.” R. Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 69.

<sup>113</sup> Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 10.

<sup>114</sup> Crone, *Meccan Trade*, 223.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 224.

<sup>116</sup> Gerald Hawting, “Al-Ḥudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca: A Reconsideration of the Tradition about the Muslim Takeover of the Sanctuary,” in *The Life of Muḥammad*, ed. Uri Rubin (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998), 261.

that at one time the conquest of Mecca was not such an obvious context as it now appears.

The view of Michael Cook is essentially the same as that of Crone. In his analysis of the varying reports on the Prophet's father 'Abd Allāh's death, he discovers that al-Wāqidī knew best in comparison to his predecessors: "This evolution in the course of half a century from uncertainty to profusion of precise detail is an instructive one. It suggests that a fair amount of what Waqidi knew was not knowledge."<sup>117</sup> Like Crone, Cook recognizes the role of the storytellers in the manufacturing of traditions: "We have seen what half a century of story-telling could achieve between Ibn Ishaq and Waqidi."<sup>118</sup> For Cook, al-Wāqidī's "superior" knowledge is a reflection of the continuing evolution of oral tradition.<sup>119</sup>

*The Views of Mattock and Lecker*

J. N. Mattock finds significant not only the variations but also the many similarities between the texts of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī. For Mattock, the variations and similarities are tantamount to the effects of oral transmission within Greek epic in which the author kept to the essential storyline but changed certain details in accordance to the situation and his purpose.<sup>120</sup> In the case of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, the similarities which amount to the general outline of the events indicate the borrowings by al-Wāqidī, and the variations represent al-Wāqidī's manipulations of Ibn Ishāq's text.

Michael Lecker argues against the view that al-Wāqidī drew from storytellers whose traditions evolved from one generation to the next. For Lecker, such a view is

---

<sup>117</sup> Michael Cook, *Muhammad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 64.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>120</sup> J. N. Mattock, "History and Fiction," in *Occasional Papers of the School of Abbasid Studies*, ed. D. E. P. Jackson (Edinburgh: University of St. Andrews, 1986): 96-97. Mattock asserts, "The composition varies, in the emphasis placed on certain elements and in the role played by them, to suit the particular audience being entertained."

problematic, since it takes into account too limited a selection of primary sources by considering only Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī. He proposes that a much larger range of sources should be analyzed since “the evidence we are looking for could have wandered about everywhere in the Islamic literature.”<sup>121</sup> Lecker puts forward that “Wāqidī’s presumed ‘superior knowledge’ came from one of his sources and belonged to the major historiographical movement of the 1<sup>st</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>122</sup> He refers to Geo Widengren who said, “[A] source of a considerably later date than other texts . . . may in certain cases contain traditions in a more original form which in older sources have been exposed to abridgements.”<sup>123</sup> It is possible then, according to Lecker, for the text of al-Wāqidī to contain earlier material than the text of Ibn Ishāq.<sup>124</sup> If Lecker is correct, then it no longer makes any sense to designate sources as “early” or “late” based upon the date of the work completed.<sup>125</sup> It also becomes meaningless to regard the traditionists as “representatives of a unified historical outlook,” a view advanced by Wellhausen in which adducing the *isnād* of Ibn Ishāq or al-Wāqidī is unnecessary but in which each compiler himself may be reckoned as the ultimate authority.<sup>126</sup>

As far as Lecker is concerned, the early traditionists reliably reproduced the traditions of their predecessors and as a result were on the whole trustworthy. If two

---

<sup>121</sup> Michael Lecker, “The Death of the Prophet Muḥammad’s Father: Did Wāqidī Invent Some of the Evidence?” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 145 (1995): 12-13.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 17. As an example, Widengren said concerning al-Azraqī and al-Fāsī: “Al-Azraqī died 244 A.H. but his work was reedited in later times by al-Fāsī, died 832 A.H.” Geo Widengren, “Oral Tradition and Written Literature among the Hebrews in the Light of Arabic Evidence, with Special Regard to Prose Narratives,” *Acta Orientalia* 23 (1959): 253.

<sup>124</sup> Lecker’s mentor M. J. Kister had argued that late *sīra* compilations are capable of containing otherwise lost material: “The late compilations . . . contain an immense wealth of material derived from early sources. Some of these traditions, stories, reports and narratives are derived from lost or hitherto unpublished sources. Some traditions, including early ones, were apparently omitted in the generally accepted *Sīrah* compilations, faded into oblivion, but reappeared in these late compilations.” M. J. Kister, “The *Sīrah* Literature,” in Beeston, 367. In an examination of later Shī’ite literature, Kister is able to find a report from the *sīra* of Wahb b. Munabbih (d. 110/728) which is non-existent in early extant sources. M. J. Kister, “On the papyrus of Wahb ibn Munabbih,” *BSOAS* 37 (1974), 562-71. For a specific case of a version bridging Shī’ite and Sunnī tradition, see *ibid.*, 569.

<sup>125</sup> Lecker, “The Death,” 17.

<sup>126</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, vol. 6, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin: George Reimer, 1899), 4. Noth argued against Wellhausen’s position that the early major historians were representatives of a uniform historical view. Albecht Noth, “Der Charakter der ersten grossen Sammlungen von Nachrichten zur frühen Kalifenzeit,” *Der Islam* 47 (1971): 168, 197.

sources contain the same report but with different *isnāds* attached, Lecker argues that they should be trusted rather than be treated with the suspicion that one of the reports was fabricated.<sup>127</sup> In his analysis of the story of the death of Muḥammad’s father, Lecker argues against the claim that the additional material of al-Wāqidī is spurious and maintains that in essence the early traditionists were not in the business of concocting evidence. This is true for Lecker not only for Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī but also for earlier transmitters such as al-Zuhrī. For Lecker a reconstruction of the material of al-Zuhrī and his contemporaries is possible and allows for the tracing of the roots of early Islamic historiography to the first/seventh century.<sup>128</sup>

In the event that the text of al-Wāqidī contains “extra” material than the text of Ibn Ishāq, Lecker states that “this probably means that the former chose, for whatever reason, to include a point which the latter chose to discard.”<sup>129</sup> In other words, rather than understanding the discrepancy as an elaboration on the part of al-Wāqidī, it should instead be regarded as an omission on the part of Ibn Ishāq. Thus the “extra” material in al-Wāqidī was available from the first century AH, and its lack of mention in Ibn Ishāq was due not to its invention between the time of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī but to Ibn Ishāq’s decision to omit it for his version.

Lecker’s theory of the origins of Islamic historiography consists of two phases in its evolution.<sup>130</sup> The first phase, which occurred in the first/seventh century, saw the production within several decades of a substantial amount of historiographical material. The material was preserved in traditions mainly by those interested in the history of their families and clans, and the content of the traditions varied in that some traditions agreed with one another while others did not. The traditions then became

---

<sup>127</sup> Lecker, “The Death,” 20.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>130</sup> His theory is similar to that of M. J. Kister, who stated that *sīra* literature “developed in the first half of the first century of the *hijra*, and by the end of that century the first full-length literary compilations were produced.” Kister, “Sīrah Literature,” 352.

scattered among many people, and the experts who collected the traditions arranged them in chronological order.<sup>131</sup> During this time, the credentials of the informants were not checked, and the traditions were collected from anyone who possessed, or claimed to possess, new information about the history of his family or clan.<sup>132</sup> According to Lecker, this first phase witnessed the early crystallization of the traditions.<sup>133</sup>

The second phase in Lecker's theory began in the latter half of the first/seventh century and continued into the second/eighth century. At this time, compilers such as al-Zuhrī, Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī sifted the massive body of material handed down to them by their predecessors and selected those traditions they considered to be reliable. Their manner of selection by which they chose from different sources resulted in divergences among their collections. According to Lecker, the compilers may have reduced the reliability of their compilations by making editions in the text and its arrangement, but they did not invent new details. These compilers represent an advanced state in the formation of *sīra* literature.<sup>134</sup>

### *The Combined Report*

A significant issue that complicates the matter of determining from where a compiler received his material is the combined report. As the name indicates, the combined report was a method utilized by the early Muslim compilers in which a few or many reports were combined into one account. Widengren provided a definition of the combined report: “[T]raditions from the outset entirely independent of each other, nay even in apparent contradiction, and thus to be classified as parallel versions of one

---

<sup>131</sup> Lecker, “The Death,” 11.

<sup>132</sup> Lecker, “Wāqidī’s Account of the Status of the Jews of Medina: A Study of a Combined Report,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54, no. 1 (1995): 25.

<sup>133</sup> Widengren had asserted that the crystallization of the traditions took place early: “[S]īrah and ḥadīth [were] from the outset written down.” Geo Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948), 56.

<sup>134</sup> Lecker, “The Death,” 11-12.

episode, are combined into one narrative by being arranged in a chronological order.”<sup>135</sup> The combined report may have served to make easier the task of recording traditions; the problem however with such a device was its potential in its implementation in losing important data.

Al-Wāqidī’s use of the combined report already received criticism by various Muslim authorities, of whom notably was Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855): “I don’t disapprove of anything of him [al-Wāqidī] except for his collecting of *isnāds* and his producing of one text with an orderly narrative from a group of people who sometimes disagreed” (*laysa unkiru ‘alayhi shay’an illā jam’ahu l-asānīda wa-majī’ahu bi-matn wāḥid ‘alā siyāqa wāḥida ‘an jamā’a wa-rubbamā ikhtalafū*).<sup>136</sup> Ibn Ḥanbal also showed his disapproval of the combined report with Ibn Ishāq, who did not “separate the words” (*lā yaḥsilu kalām dhā min kalām dhā*) when transmitting a *ḥadīth* from a group of informants.<sup>137</sup> Such practice for Ibn Ḥanbal disqualified a traditionist from being an authority. Ibn Ḥanbal’s stance against the combined report was shared by the leading *ḥadīth* experts. Of the six canonical *ḥadīth* collections, Ibn Māja’s collection contains the only *ḥadīth* by al-Wāqidī, which does not name al-Wāqidī in the *isnād* but refers to him in the ambiguous phrase “one of our shaykhs” (*shaykh lanā*).<sup>138</sup>

For the historian today, the combined report is problematic when attempting to recover the earliest strata of the *sīra*, for when the reports were merged, some important data that included indications of a report’s origin was often lost.<sup>139</sup> The modern historian is also faced with the possibility that data was deliberately suppressed. For any given event, there may have been conflicting versions from the

<sup>135</sup> Widengren, “Oral Tradition,” 241.

<sup>136</sup> Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh Baghdād*, 3:16.

<sup>137</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:43.

<sup>138</sup> Shams al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Dhahabī, *Siyār a’lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ūt and Ḥusayn al-Asad (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1981-88), 9:463-64, 469. Al-Dhahabī states that Ibn Māja did not refer to al-Wāqidī due to the opinions of *ḥadīth* experts of him as weak: *fa-mā jasara Ibn Māja an yuḥsiha bi-hi wa-mā dhāka illā li-wahni l-Wāqidī ‘inda l-‘ulamā’*.

<sup>139</sup> Widengren, commenting on the development of the *sīra*, said that “the single tradition is more trustworthy than the context where it is found.” Widengren, “Oral Tradition,” 235.

very start. Utilization of the combined report then made it possible to not mention and thereby eliminate one report for the sake of upholding the preferred one. Lecker states, “[T]he Combined Report creates an illusion of coherence where there might be dispute and of consistency where, in fact, major differences might exist.”<sup>140</sup> In addition the combined report made possible the fusion of different events into one event,<sup>141</sup> and a reconstruction of the original reports may result in several rival ‘truths’ rather than just one.<sup>142</sup>

In a study of one of al-Wāqidī’s combined reports, Lecker shows that a passage from al-Wāqidī’s introduction to the story of the assassination of the Jewish leader Ka’b b. al-Ashraf is corrupt.<sup>143</sup> The corruption is the identification of the Jewish clans of Medina as the clients of the Arab clans. Lecker maintains that the passage should rather state that the Jewish clans were the strongest element in the population of Medina. By comparing al-Wāqidī’s sources for his combined report with al-Wāqidī’s combined report itself, Lecker concludes that al-Wāqidī, probably unintentionally, changed the statement concerning the status of the Jews. For example, Lecker shows through a comparison between the edited report (i.e., combined report) of al-Wāqidī and the unedited report of the later compiler al-Bayhaqī (384/994-458/1066) not only the original report but also the editing that took place. Thus there existed, in Lecker’s view, two kinds of texts, edited (combined report) and unedited, both which traditionists transmitted throughout the course of early and late Islamic history.

The same combined report of al-Wāqidī was analyzed by Faizer. She responds to Lecker, arguing that al-Wāqidī’s representation of the Jews as clients of the Arabs rather

---

<sup>140</sup> Lecker, “Wāqidī’s Account,” 22.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Ella Landau-Tasserion, “Processes of Redaction: The Case of the Tamīmite Delegation to the Prophet Muḥammad,” *BSOAS* 49 (1986): 262-63. Schoeler observes that al-Wāqidī fused different events into one even when he did not indicate a combined report. Schoeler, *Charakter*, 137-40.

<sup>142</sup> Lecker, “Wāqidī’s Account,” 27.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

than as their original description as the strongest clan in Medina was deliberate.<sup>144</sup> This purposeful misrepresentation suited al-Wāqidī's own version of the Prophet's biography, and the combined report was a means by which al-Wāqidī accomplished his objective. According to Faizer, the combined report was one of the numerous methods used by al-Wāqidī to manipulate and distort seemingly well-known traditions in order to generate a new interpretation of the Prophet's life.<sup>145</sup>

In Faizer's estimation, most of the edits by al-Wāqidī were performed on the traditions in the text of Ibn Ishāq. She considers that al-Wāqidī understood well the text's structure and format but cared little for authenticity and its reliable reproduction.<sup>146</sup> Al-Wāqidī clearly possessed a more stylistic approach which enabled him "to recontextualize, through the repetition and transference of traditions, the narrative accounts of events and the characterization of personalities as established by Ibn Ishaq."<sup>147</sup> Since the available material lacked a context, the compiler was able to create a distinct *maghāzī* according to his own goals and interests: "It is the compiler who selects the pieces of information—available in a decontextualized state—with which to compose his text, and it is the compiler who decides the sequence in which to place them." She refers to the work of Stefan Leder who explicates the process by which the composition took place:

These sources are not transmitted in their entirety; instead single *akhbār* are taken out and woven into a new context consisting of material from different sources. Within the compilation, the khabar forms a mobile element which may be described as a module; it is not a constituent part of an integrated overall-composition . . . The khabar is described as a

---

<sup>144</sup> Rizwi S. Faizer, "The Issue of Authenticity Regarding the Traditions of al-Wāqidī as Established in his Kitāb al-Maghāzī," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 58, no. 2 (1999): 105.

<sup>145</sup> Faizer, "Issue of Authenticity," 98. Faizer provides an example in which al-Wāqidī manipulated a tradition in order to advance his own position. In the identification of the person or group responsible for the execution of Banū Qurayza, Ibn Ishāq's placement of the tradition of Sa'd's prayer against the Jews within the event of the battle of al-Khandaq conveys the idea that the fate of the Jews was due to Sa'd's prayer in which he sought God's permission to oppose them. Al-Wāqidī on the other hand casts blame on the Jews themselves by placing within the event of the raid on Banū Qurayza the tradition of the Jewish abrogation of their agreement with the Prophet and their subsequent attack against him. Faizer, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī Revisited," 209-10.

<sup>146</sup> Faizer, "Issue of Authenticity," 98.

<sup>147</sup> Faizer, "Muhammad and the Medinan Jews," 469.

mobile component which may appear at different stages of a complex process of reproduction and be characterized by its own idiosyncrasy.<sup>148</sup>

For Faizer, the activity had nothing to do with providing more accurate information, but with style, creativity and technique.

*The Views of Faizer and Schoeler*

Faizer assesses the charge of al-Wāqidī's dependenc upon Ibn Ishāq to be unjustified. She argues that al-Wāqidī, when utilizing the text of Ibn Ishāq, knew that his readers would recognize the writings of the authority he purposefully neglected to acknowledge: "The use of familiar material was essential, however, for it provided the foundation and the framework within which al-Wāqidī could display his skills and make certain that those who knew the popular Ibn Ishāq compilation would recognize immediately the intricate weavings of new material that al-Wāqidī introduced into the account."<sup>149</sup> For Faizer, al-Wāqidī desired to display his knowledge of the traditions of Ibn Ishāq, as well as those of al-Zuhrī, Ibn ʿUmar and other Muslim authorities. At the same time however, al-Wāqidī disagreed with Ibn Ishāq over certain details and chronology and considered some of his traditions to be out of context. By purposefully failing to cite Ibn Ishāq and yet by ensuring that his use of Ibn Ishāq's familiar traditions was recognizable, al-Wāqidī, Faizer contends, brilliantly found a way of displaying Ibn Ishāq as an authority without citing him.

---

<sup>148</sup> Stefan Leder, "Authorship and Transmission in Unauthored Literature: The Akhbār attributed to Haytham ibn ʿAdī," *Oriens* (1988): 67-68. Cf. the words of Hawting in his observation of traditions related to al-Ḥudaybiyya and Mecca: "Hardly any of the forms of tradition itself contain an indication of the context, that is, when the incident took place. From the citations of it in *ḥadīth* collections it would rarely be possible to say when the Prophet entered the Ka'ba and prayed. In *sīra* and *ta'rikh*, on the other hand, the form of the literature obviously demands an historical setting and this is supplied by including the tradition at a particular point in the life of the Prophet." Hawting, "Al-Ḥudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca," 18. Also, Rosenthal: "*Aḥbār* corresponds to history in the sense of story, anecdote. It does not imply any fixation in time, nor is it ever restricted to mean an organically connected series of events. The term later on assumed the additional meaning of information about the deeds and sayings of Muḥammad, and, in particular, the ancient Muslim authorities. . . . [*Aḥbār*] became in fact something of a synonym of *ḥadīth*." Franz Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 11.

<sup>149</sup> Faizer, "Issue of Authenticity," 101-2.

That al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Ishāq is also argued by Gregor Schoeler who performed an *isnād-cum-matn* analysis on the story of the scandal involving ‘Ā’isha (i.e., *ḥadīth al-ifk*). As proof, Schoeler points out that al-Wāqidī in his own narrative of the scandal story followed nearly word for word the recension of Ibn Ishāq, even as Ibn Ishāq interpolated a tradition into the story.<sup>150</sup> Schoeler shows that al-Wāqidī also followed the recensions or traditions of al-Zuhrī and a certain al-Muwaqqarī, even though al-Wāqidī did not cite the three authorities but falsified the *isnād* (in contrast to Ibn Ishāq who used the sources given in his *isnād*).<sup>151</sup>

According to Schoeler, the scandal story probably goes back to ‘Ā’isha through both al-Zuhrī and another authority, Hishām. In addition to his optimism that the transmission was reliable, the genuineness of the scandal story is likely for Schoeler. He puts forward that the original form of the story was *ḥadīth* and not *qāṣṣ* material.<sup>152</sup> Thus his view of early Islamic historiography is that at least some material was not the product of the *qāṣṣ* but that the material was transmitted authentically from the time of the Prophet by those close to him. Schoeler further maintains that at least the main outlines of the events of the Medinan period were correctly transmitted by and are traceable back to ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712).

The main objective of chapter 2 is to determine whether al-Wāqidī drew from without citing Ibn Ishāq. Through a word-for-word comparison between the works of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Ishāq, the question of dependence is answerable in the detection of parallels and/or variations. Other aims of the analysis, given al-Wāqidī’s use of the combined report, are the identification of other sources from where al-Wāqidī may have drawn and the discovery of any edits al-Wāqidī may have performed in the

---

<sup>150</sup> Schoeler, *Charakter*, 138.

<sup>151</sup> Schoeler states that his discovery of the three authorities as al-Wāqidī’s sources is “absolutely compelling—even if he [al-Wāqidī] often made changes or paraphrased and even when he sometimes brought additional material the origin of which we can say nothing.” *Ibid.*, 141-42.

<sup>152</sup> He argues against the order of early to late versions put forward by Wansbrough. For Schoeler, the original version is that of al-Bukhārī, then Ibn Ishāq, and then al-Wāqidī.

formation of his *Maghāzī*. For al-Wāqidī's material, the analysis makes use of the textual critical edition of his *Kitāb al-maghāzī* which was published by Jones in 1966.<sup>153</sup> The main manuscript upon which the edition is based (B.M. Or. 1617) is the only complete copy of the work known to exist.<sup>154</sup> In addition to the manuscripts, Jones made use of quotations from al-Wāqidī found in other sources, such as Ibn Sa'd, al-Balādhurī, al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, al-Zurqānī and al-Samhūdī.

### Analyzing Material Ascribed to Mūsā b. 'Uqba

#### Mūsā b. 'Uqba and his *Kitāb al-maghāzī*

Explored in chapter 3 is the material attributed to Mūsā b. 'Uqba.<sup>155</sup> According to Muslim traditional literature, Mūsā was a *mawlā* of Umm Khālid, the wife of al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām. A Medinan scholar and historian, Mūsā was known for his work on the Prophet's *maghāzī*.<sup>156</sup> He is said to have learned under al-Zuhrī, the master of Ibn Ishāq, and unlike Ibn Ishāq, Mūsā kept no relations with the ruling court.<sup>157</sup> According to Ibn Ma'īn, al-Zuhrī was Mūsā's weightiest authority: "Mūsā's book goes back to al-Zuhrī and is among the most trustworthy of these writings."<sup>158</sup> The connection to al-Zuhrī was also made by Mālik b. Anas.<sup>159</sup> For his reputation, Mūsā was considered a reliable

<sup>153</sup> Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, ed. Marsden Jones, 3 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

<sup>154</sup> For Jones's discussion of the various manuscripts utilized for his edition, see the preface to *ibid.*, 1:v-viii.

<sup>155</sup> *EP*, s.v. "Mūsā b. 'Uqba al-Asadī"; 'Umar Riḍā Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam al-mu'allifīn: muṣannifī-l-kutub al-'arabiya* (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqī, 1957-61), 13:43; Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1:140-41; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:286-87.

<sup>156</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:360.

<sup>157</sup> In Mūsā's case, the Umayyads. Horowitz, *Earliest Biographies*, 69.

<sup>158</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:361-62.

<sup>159</sup> Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:117. Schoeler asserts that by "*kitāb Mūsā 'an al-Zuhrī*" is probably meant Mūsā's copies of his lectures by al-Zuhrī. Gregor Schoeler, "Mūsā b. 'Uqbas Maghāzī," in *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*, ed. Harald Motzki (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 71.

traditionist and was given the title *Ṣāhib al-Maghāzī*.<sup>160</sup> It is said that Mūsā used to study in the Prophet's mosque with his brothers, also experts in *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*.<sup>161</sup>

The traditional literature attests to the composition of a book of *maghāzī* by Mūsā. Mālik b. Anas is reported to have said: '*alaykum bi-maghāzī Mūsā b. 'Uqba*'.<sup>162</sup> Elsewhere, Mālik confirmed the reliability of Mūsā's work: "You must hold to the *maghāzī* of Mūsā, for he is trustworthy."<sup>163</sup> In contrast, Mālik disparaged the work of the biographer's junior contemporary Ibn Ishāq.<sup>164</sup> Ibn Ḥanbal also regarded Mūsā's work highly, esteeming it as trustworthy: '*alaykum bi-maghāzī Ibn 'Uqba fa-innahu thiqatun*'.<sup>165</sup> Ibn Sa'd for his *Ṭabaqāt* included traditions of Mūsā, and al-Ṭabarī incorporated a number of Mūsā's reports in his *Ta'rīkh*.

The book itself is not extant, but analyses of Mūsā-material by modern scholars indicate that the contents of the book were originally arranged chronologically<sup>166</sup> and not only included the life of the Prophet but also extended to the time of the *Rashidūn* and the first Umayyads.<sup>167</sup> The latest traditions transmitted under Mūsā's name pertain to the Battle of Ḥarra (63/683) and an event during the governorship of Khālīd al-Qasrī

<sup>160</sup> Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rīkh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. 'Umar Gharāmah al-'Amrawī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-98), 60:456, quoted in Michael Lecker, "King ibn Ubayy and the Quṣṣās," in *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, ed. Herbert Berg (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 67.

<sup>161</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:362.

<sup>162</sup> Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:115.

<sup>163</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:361.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:45.

<sup>165</sup> Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *Al-A'lām: qāmūs tarājīm al-ashhar al-rijāl wa-l-nisā' min al-'arab wa-l-musta'rabīn wa-l-mustashriqīn* (Cairo, 1959), 8:276; see Jones, "Maghāzī Literature," 346.

<sup>166</sup> Jones comments on the chronological framework of the *Maghāzī* of Mūsā b. 'Uqba, Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī: "This is not to be wondered at, since a sense of chronology is an essential phase in the nascent development of any historical literature, and a growing consciousness of the importance of chronology seems to have marked the emergence of the *maghāzī* literature in Medina." Jones, "Maghāzī Literature," 349.

<sup>167</sup> Horowitz, *Earliest Biographies*, 166-67; Joseph Schacht, "On Mūsā b. 'Uqba's Kitāb al-Maghāzī," *Acta Orientalia* 21 (1953): 296; Schacht argued that the contents of the book did not include the time after the life of the Prophet. *Ibid.*, 292. Donner asserts the presence of some accounts of the Islamic conquests in Mūsā's *Maghāzī*: "Some *futūḥ* accounts . . . were incorporated into *maghāzī* compilations; the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* of Mūsā ibn 'Uqba . . . appears to have contained some accounts on at least the early phases of the conquests." Donner, *Narratives*, 220.

(91/710).<sup>168</sup> Such late traditions, according to Schoeler, were possibly transmitted by Mūsā outside of the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*.<sup>169</sup>

Schoeler argues that Mūsā's *Maghāzī* was not published for the wider public but was meant as an aid to lectures for a small group, a circle of students.<sup>170</sup> Schoeler also maintains that Mūsā passed on his knowledge by ceding, as his teacher al-Zuhrī and contemporaries Mālik b. Anas and Ibn Ishāq had done, his private records for the creation of copies.<sup>171</sup> The most important transmitter of Mūsā's *Kitāb*, his nephew Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. 'Uqba,<sup>172</sup> is believed by Schoeler to have transmitted the work as a whole.<sup>173</sup> Other transmitters of Mūsā's work were Muḥammad b. Fulayḥ (d. 197/812-3)<sup>174</sup> and al-Fuḍayl b. Sulaymān (d. 185/801).<sup>175</sup>

According to Abbott, Mūsā's *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was the first formal work of the Prophet's campaigns,<sup>176</sup> drawing heavily on the collections of al-Zuhrī.<sup>177</sup> Al-Zuhrī's material was then elaborated upon and augmented with other traditions.<sup>178</sup> The unfavorable assessment of the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* by al-Dhahabī considered it for the most part authentic but needful of explanation and supplementation.<sup>179</sup> Al-Dhahabī nonetheless deemed it the first systematically ordered work on the *maghāzī* and incorporated selections of it in his *Kitāb al-ta'rikh al-kabīr*.<sup>180</sup> Concerning Mūsā's legal material, Motzki argues that it is completely different from that of the Zubayrids (e.g. Hishām b. 'Urwa and 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr). Motzki maintains that "it is pure Nāfi' material which contains neither legal *dicta* of Mūsā's own nor those of Nāfi', but only

---

<sup>168</sup> Schoeler, "Mūsā," 71.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 71-72.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, 73.

<sup>172</sup> Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 5:310.

<sup>173</sup> Schoeler, "Mūsā," 72.

<sup>174</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:406-7.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:291-92.

<sup>176</sup> Nabia Abbott, "Ḥadīth Literature-II: Collection and Transmission of Ḥadīth," in Beeston, 296.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, 298.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*; Duri, "Al-Zuhrī," 12.

<sup>179</sup> Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:116.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*

traditions in which Nāfi'—i.e. the *mawlā* of 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar—who died in 118/736 or 119, is his informant."<sup>181</sup> Another distinguishing feature of Mūsā's *Maghāzī* is its absence of personal judgments by Mūsā himself.<sup>182</sup>

According to Jones, Mūsā did not make use of the full *isnād*.<sup>183</sup> Instead, “[q]uotations from him are most frequently introduced by the phrase ‘Mūsā b. ‘Uqbah said, from al-Zuhrī.’” Jones also points out that Mūsā may have employed the collective *isnād*, “when for one episode he gives as his sources ‘Ibn Shihāb, from ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. Ka’b b. Mālīk al-Sulamī and other traditionists.’”<sup>184</sup> Mūsā’s foremost authority was his maternal grandfather, Abū Ḥabība, but the oldest, most famed authority who Mūsā is reported to have made use of was Ibn ‘Abbās: “Kurrayb left with us a camel load of the writings of Ibn ‘Abbās, and if Ibn ‘Abbās’s son ‘Alī wanted a manuscript, he asked in writing for the *ṣaḥīfa* to be sent to him, which was then copied out for him.”<sup>185</sup> Schacht commented on the spuriousness of this tradition: “If the mention of a camel’s load, a fictitious measure of written papers, is not enough to show the spurious character of this tradition, the elaborate system of filing and indexing implied ought to be sufficient.”<sup>186</sup> In addition, Mūsā is reported to have possessed copies of original documents. Within his work is purportedly contained a copy of a letter addressed by the Prophet to al-Mundhir b. Sāwī.<sup>187</sup> Schacht remarked on the spurious nature also of this tradition: “The *isnād* of this tradition does not go higher than Mūsā, but it would be

---

<sup>181</sup> Motzki, *Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 224. G. H. A. Juynboll argues that the person of Nāfi' was probably invented in his “Nāfi', the *Mawlā* of Ibn 'Umar, and his Position in Muslim *Ḥadīth* Literature,” *Der Islam* 70 (1993): 207-44; Motzki responds to Juynboll in “Quo vadis, *Ḥadīth*-Forschung? Eine kritische Untersuchung von G. H. A. Juynboll: Nāfi' the *Mawlā* of Ibn 'Umar, and his Position in Muslim *Ḥadīth* Literature,” *Der Islam* 73 (1996): 40-80.

<sup>182</sup> Jones, “*Maghāzī* Literature,” 350. Concerning the insertion of personal judgments, Jones says, “So far as we can tell, Mūsā b. 'Uqbah did not do this.” Jones goes on to say that “Ibn Ishāq did it only seldom.”

<sup>183</sup> Jones says of Mūsā, “[T]he conventional *Ḥadīth*-type *isnād* was in his case the exception rather than the rule.” *Ibid.*, 348.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>185</sup> Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 5:216.

<sup>186</sup> Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 296.

<sup>187</sup> Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1866), 80:18-81:2.

arbitrary and fanciful to conclude from this that Mūsā used a copy of the original document.”<sup>188</sup> In fact, Schacht extended his criticism to the entire biography of Mūsā.<sup>189</sup>

*The Works of Mūsā and Ibn Ishāq Compared*

In Jones’s study of the raid to Nakhla and the vision of ‘Ātika, he argues that the works of Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā are greatly similar.<sup>190</sup> For the raid to Nakhla, Jones compares Ibn Ishāq’s material with the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* of Mūsā found in the works of Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Sayyid al-Nās and discovers that the two scholars reported comparable stories. Jones also maintains that Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā drew from a common corpus of traditions: “Ibn Ishāq is clearly using material shared by Mūsā b. ‘Uqba.”<sup>191</sup> For the vision of ‘Ātika, Jones makes note of a remark by Ibn Kathīr,<sup>192</sup> which observes the account of Mūsā to be similar to that of Ibn Ishāq.<sup>193</sup> The similarity between the two accounts leads Jones to posit an earlier nodal point than the generation of Mūsā and Ibn Ishāq for the development of the *sīra-maghāzī* literature. From his study, Jones concludes that “the greater part of the *sīra* was already formalized by the second century A.H.”<sup>194</sup> In another publication, Jones puts forward that the common corpus of material was highly recognized and accepted. He asserts that the central core of material was so well known that verification by conventional *isnād* was unnecessary.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>188</sup> Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 297.

<sup>189</sup> Schacht said, “The whole of the standard biography of Mūsā in the later works is without documentary value, particularly the touching picture, taken seriously by Sachau and Horowitz, of his regular lectures to a circle of pupils in the mosque of Medina. This presupposes the concept of Medina as the home of Islamic learning, a concept which was as yet unknown to Shāfi‘ī (d. 204).” *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>190</sup> Jones also remarks of the similarity between the works of Mūsā and al-Wāqidī: “Of the many works ascribed to al-Wāqidī by the bibliographers, his *K. al-Maghāzī* is the only authenticated one to come down to us; it corresponds closely in structure and content to that of Mūsā b. ‘Uqbah . . .” Jones, “Maghāzī Literature,” 346. See also Jones, “Muqaddima,” in al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:24-25.

<sup>191</sup> Jones, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī,” 51.

<sup>192</sup> Ibn Kathīr mentions but does not provide Mūsā’s version of the vision of ‘Ātika. Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar b. Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., ed. Aḥmad Abū Milḥim (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmīya, 1988), 3:258.

<sup>193</sup> Jones, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī,” 46-47.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>195</sup> Jones, “Maghāzī Literature,” 348.

In addition to the similarities, differences of detail between the versions of Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā are pointed out by Jones. For the raid to Nakhla, Mūsā's version alone mentions Safwān b. Bayḍa' and 'Āmir b. Iyās as among the raiding party whereas the reading of the Prophet's letter and the choice by the members of the party to follow 'Abd Allāh b. Jaḥsh to Nakhla are found exclusively in Ibn Ishāq's version. Moreover, whereas the version of Mūsā contains the narrative of Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and 'Utba b. Ghazwān turning back from Buḥrān while the others went on, the version of Ibn Ishāq mentions only the poem within that narrative.<sup>196</sup>

A difference of greater significance concerns the list of Muslim participants in the Battle of Badr. Mālik esteemed the list of Mūsā above others: "Those who are named in Mūsā's book as having fought at Badr did actually take part in the battle of Badr, while those whose names he does not mention did not."<sup>197</sup> Jones however points out that in the lists given by Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, "there are many variants ascribed to Mūsā b. 'Uqbah."<sup>198</sup> Jones also asserts that although there is unanimous agreement among the sources on the dating of the Battle of Badr,<sup>199</sup> other datings are often at variance between Mūsā and other historians.<sup>200</sup> Lawrence Conrad shows the variance between Mūsā and others in regard to the date of Muḥammad's birth. While Mūsā reported the date as seventy years after 'Ām al-fīl (The Year of the Elephant),

---

<sup>196</sup> Jones, "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī," 51.

<sup>197</sup> Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:361.

<sup>198</sup> Jones, "Maghāzī Literature," 351; Schoeler for his part points out the existence of variants not only in the lists concerning Badr but also in the list of emigrants to Abyssinia and the list of the slain in the battle of Uḥud. Schoeler also notes that Mūsā transmitted these lists from al-Zuhrī. Schoeler, "Mūsā," 72n27.

<sup>199</sup> J. M. B. Jones, "The Chronology of the *Maghāzī*: A Textual Survey," *BSOAS* 19 (1957): 247. Crone however in an examination of an eighth-century papyrus from Khirbat al-Mird in Palestine shows that an alternative date for Badr was in vogue before the practice of identifying events with scriptural passages became the common practice. She asserts, "The Qur'ānic allusions would thus seem to have generated the classical dates, causing earlier ones to be lost." Crone, *Meccan Trade*, 229.

<sup>200</sup> Leone Caetani pointed this out in his *Annali dell'Islām* (Milan: Hoepli, 1905), 1:466. See also Jones, "Chronology of the *Maghāzī*."

Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763)<sup>201</sup> reported the event as fifteen years before 'Ām al-fīl, and al-Zuhrī placed it as thirty years after 'Ām al-fīl.<sup>202</sup>

For the analysis in chapter 3, the similarities and differences between the material of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā are made clear. The amount and kind of similarities and differences discovered determine whether equivalent or divergent understandings of Badr are being reported. Whenever possible, the reason for a divergence is identified in order to shed light on the varied manner in which the material was utilized.

### *The Muntakhab*

A short fragment of Mūsā's *Maghāzī* has survived and was brought into publication by Eduard Sachau in 1904.<sup>203</sup> This Berlin "fragment" Ahlwardt No. 1552, otherwise known as the *Muntakhab* (Selection), is contained in a manuscript from the eighth/fourteenth century.<sup>204</sup> Of the twenty traditions that comprise the fragment and that are referred to as "selected from the *maghāzī*," nineteen go back to Mūsā through his nephew Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. 'Uqba.<sup>205</sup> At the places where Mūsā cites al-Zuhrī, the formulas *qāla Ibn Shihāb* and *za'ama Ibn Shihāb* are considered by Horovitz as indications that Mūsā transmitted the written notes of al-Zuhrī.<sup>206</sup> In one instance in which the formula *ḥaddathanī al-Zuhrī* is utilized, Horovitz understands that there was direct communication (al-Zuhrī narrated to me [Mūsā]) between the two.

<sup>201</sup> Conrad shows that al-Kalbī offered another opinion which placed the date of Muḥammad's birth twenty-three years after the event. Lawrence I. Conrad, "Abraha and Muḥammad: Some Observations Apropos of Chronology and Literary Topoi in the Early Arabic Historical Tradition," *BSOAS* 50, no. 2 (1987): 234.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>203</sup> Eduard Sachau, "Das Berliner Fragment des Mūsā ibn 'Uqba. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss des ältesten arabischen Geschichtsliteratur," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 9 (1904): 445-70. For a partial translation of the "fragment" in English, see the introduction to Guillaume, *Life of Muḥammad*, xliii.

<sup>204</sup> The exact title is *Aḥādīth muntakhaba* (Selected Traditions).

<sup>205</sup> Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 5:310. Ismā'īl's students are Ismā'īl b. Abī Uways 'Abd Allāh (226/840-41) and Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Attāb (344/955-56). Sachau, "Berliner Fragment," 449; Schacht, "On Mūsā," 289.

<sup>206</sup> Horovitz, *Earliest Biographies*, 70.

The *Muntakhab* was studied by Schacht, who argued that the biographical material within was devoid of historical value:

A considerable part of the standard biography of the Prophet in Medina, as it appeared in the second half of the second century A.H., was of very recent origin and is therefore without independent historical value; the vague collective memory of the community was formalized, systematized, replenished with details and shaped into formal traditions with proper *isnāds* only in the second century A.H.<sup>207</sup>

For Schacht, the contents of the Fragment's traditions are of a kind expected of the middle of the second Islamic century.<sup>208</sup> He asserted that "Abbasid traces are unmistakable; the strong anti-Alid tendency and, particularly, the favourable attitude to the caliphate of Abū Bakr even point to a period somewhat later than the very first years of Abbasid rule."<sup>209</sup> Other traditions "which seem to express an historical interest pure and simple, include longish, composite, romantic stories."<sup>210</sup> Then there are traditions "inspired by a family interest, insofar as they set out to recount . . . some exploit or achievement of a member of the family or tribe who relate it in the first place."<sup>211</sup> For Schacht, the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* in its original form did not contain traditions from authorities other than Zuhri,<sup>212</sup> and the traditions going back to al-Zuhri themselves were falsely ascribed to him by Mūsā.<sup>213</sup>

Schacht also criticized the manner in which the *isnād* was utilized. He maintained that a family *isnād* was spun out of Mūsā's name and was then used for accrediting traditions that were not part of the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*.<sup>214</sup> In addition, Schacht noticed that the *isnāds* of parallel traditions in al-Bukhārī "spread" (i.e. fictitious names

---

<sup>207</sup> Schacht, "On Mūsā," 288. For Schacht's thesis on the Islamic legal traditions, see Schacht, "A Reevaluation of Islamic Traditions," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 49 (1949): 143-54.

<sup>208</sup> Schacht, "On Mūsā," 289.

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*, 290.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 293.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*, 291.

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.*, 292, 300.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 294.

were added) from those of their counterpart in the *Muntakhab*.<sup>215</sup> Based on this observation, Schacht argued for the futility of utilizing the *isnāds* in discovering the transmission of the traditions: “To attempt to deduce from these artificial *isnāds*—and this includes the *isnāds* of outside traditions from Mūsā—the way in which the material contained in the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* might have been transmitted, would be idle.”<sup>216</sup> Even statements in later biographical works in which persons heard from and passed on traditions from Mūsā are fictitious for Schacht.

In another publication, Schacht delineated two kinds of material found in the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*:

1. lists of persons who took part in important events in the life of the Prophet (and, by implication, of the events themselves), and
2. “traditions” of the *xabar* type which, although claiming to relate historical events, often express political tendencies not earlier than Mūsā's own generation, or the interest of families and individuals in the exploits of their ancestors, as well as that of the general public in romantic stories of the heroic period of Islam, an interest for which the story-tellers (*quṣṣās*) used to cater.<sup>217</sup>

The relationship between the two is understood by Donner to be that the latter kind, the stories reflecting political, family and personal interests, were later added to the former, the lists of participants in the Prophet's life.<sup>218</sup>

Schacht's assertions are challenged by Schoeler who compares the *Muntakhab* with Mūsā-material brought to light since the time of Schacht. According to Schoeler, twelve of the nineteen Mūsā-traditions in the *Muntakhab* are found in al-Bayhaqī's *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, and eleven of that twelve are identical or nearly identical in wording. The remaining traditions are contained in the collections of other traditionists such as al-Bukhārī, al-Tayālīsī, Ibn Sa'd, 'Abd al-Razzāq and 'Umar b. Shabba.<sup>219</sup> Schoeler also points to the work of M. H. Salmān who followed in the line of Sachau but documented

<sup>215</sup> Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 297.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>217</sup> Joseph Schacht, review of *A History of Muslim Historiography*, by Franz Rosenthal, *Oriens* 7 (1954): 154.

<sup>218</sup> Donner, *Narratives*, 220.

<sup>219</sup> According to Schoeler, Ibn Shabba's (d. 264/877) collection may be in the same form as the work of Mūsā. Schoeler asserts that the collection of Ibn Shabba is in chronological order when possible but without linking remarks or commentaries by the author or transmitter. Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 72.

a wealth of additional sources possessing traditions by Mūsā.<sup>220</sup> In addition, the Moroccan scholar Muḥammad Bāqshīsh Abū Mālik undertook a compilation of all known traditions going back to Mūsā and provided references to the parallel traditions in the footnotes.<sup>221</sup>

Schoeler's reexamination of the *Muntakhab* assesses that Schacht was incorrect on a number of accounts. In the first place, Schoeler argues that a tradition in the *Muntakhab* believed by Schacht to contain an anti-ʿAlid bias is in actuality free of tendentiousness.<sup>222</sup> By referring to a parallel tradition in the work of al-Ṭayālīsī, Schoeler suggests that two traditions that had been severed in the *Muntakhab*—Schacht had based his assessment on one of the severed traditions—in reality formed one tradition free of any tendentiousness. The comparison with the parallel tradition in the work of al-Ṭayālīsī also demonstrates that Schacht's assessment of fictitiousness of the other of the two traditions was incorrect. For Schoeler, since al-Ṭayālīsī traces back to Mūsā in a divergent strand of transmission, the corresponding tradition in the *Muntakhab* did in reality form part of Mūsā's original book or was at least authentically transmitted on Mūsā's authority.<sup>223</sup>

Secondly, Schoeler argues against Schacht's view that Mūsā's ascriptions to al-Zuhrī were always fictitious. Schacht had based this fictitiousness upon his theory of the "growing backward" of the *isnāds*.<sup>224</sup> Schoeler however, by referring to independent parallel traditions in ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*—the parallel traditions are transmitted by ʿAbd al-Razzāq on the authority of Maʿmar b. Rāshid from al-Zuhrī—argues that the

<sup>220</sup> Mashhūr Ḥasan Salmān, *Aḥādīth muntakhaba min Maḡhāzī Mūsā b. ʿUqba* (Beirut, 1991).

<sup>221</sup> Mūsā b. ʿUqba, *Al-Maḡhāzī*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqshīsh Abū Mālik (Agadir: Jāmiʿat Ibn Zuhr, Kulliyat al-Ādāb wa-l-ʿUlūm al-Insāniya, 1994). Commenting on Abū Mālik's collection, Schoeler mentions the need for a textual comparison of the various transmissions of Mūsā-traditions. Schoeler, "Mūsā," 70.

<sup>222</sup> Schacht, "On Mūsā," 290. Guillaume asserts the lack of preference awarded to the ʿAlids: "Clearly Mūsā's sympathies lay with the family of al-Zubayr and the Anṣār. They alone emerge with credit. The Alids, on the other hand, are no better than anyone else." Guillaume, introduction to *Life of Muḥammad*, xlvii.

<sup>223</sup> Schacht had assumed that only those traditions that Mūsā related on the authority of al-Zuhrī formed part of Mūsā's original *Kitāb al-maḡhāzī*.

<sup>224</sup> For a reply to Schacht, see Motzki, *Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*.

traditions in both the works of Mūsā and ‘Abd al-Razzāq must go back to a common source, namely, al-Zuhrī.<sup>225</sup>

Schoeler goes further by arguing for the likelihood that a tradition in the *Muntakhab* was genuinely transmitted by al-Zuhrī’s teacher, ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr. This time Schoeler consults Ibn Abī Shayba’s *Muṣannaf* from which he shows that a parallel tradition was independently transmitted by ‘Urwa through his son Hishām b. ‘Urwa. The independence of the transmissions demonstrates, according to Schoeler, that ‘Urwa recorded and transmitted the report of a contemporary of the event, namely, his father.<sup>226</sup>

Finally Schoeler argues for the untenability of Schacht’s belief in the presence of pro-‘Abbāsīd traces in the *Muntakhab*.<sup>227</sup> According to Schoeler, parallel Mūsā-traditions to the purportedly biased one in the *Muntakhab* make clear the absence of pro-‘Abbāsīd bias by maintaining that Muḥammad refused to waive the ransom for his uncle who was captured at Badr.<sup>228</sup> The earlier date of Mūsā’s death (d. 141/758) than that of Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767) and al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) is suggestive of Mūsā’s autonomy from the ‘Abbāsīd court.

For the analysis in chapter 3, the material ascribed to Mūsā is examined for any political biases. For the Mūsā-material, the analysis makes use of al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il*.<sup>229</sup> Given Schoeler’s discovery of the closeness in wording of a number of Mūsā-traditions between the *Muntakhab* and the *Dalā’il*, the *Dalā’il* offers up till now the greatest prospect of containing authentic Mūsā-traditions. Be that as it may, it is possible that al-Bayhaqī’s Mūsā-material for the Badr story underwent intended and unintended

---

<sup>225</sup> Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 94.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 94-95.

<sup>227</sup> Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 290.

<sup>228</sup> Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 95.

<sup>229</sup> Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa wa-ma’rifat aḥwāl ṣāhib al-sharī’a*, ed. ‘Abd al-Muḥī Qal’ajī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiya, 1985), 3:101-21. Abū Mālīk for his compilation drew from al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il* for the narrative of Badr. Mūsā b. ‘Uqba, *Al-Maghāzī*, 122. The *isnād* for the Badr narrative concludes with Mūsā’s nephew Ismā’il b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uqba.

changes over the course of its transmission. As a result, the lack of a textual critical edition entails that the analysis be concerned not with the actual words of Mūsā but with the material that has been ascribed to him.

#### A Note on Historiography

The present study's concern is with the material itself and not with discovering "what really happened" as regards the Battle of Badr; neither a historical kernel nor a reconstruction is sought.<sup>230</sup> The analyses in the following chapters have to do with the manner in which the material reflects the concerns, biases and pressures of the day. All played a role in the way the life of Muḥammad was presented. With this approach, one may come to a better understanding not only of how various *sīra* material was differently affected and utilized but also of what motives lay behind the material.

It has been argued that historical writing in 'Abbāsīd days is of value as a source in so far as it reflects Islam's religious and political development. According to E. L. Petersen, such late writing provides valuable information not on the events themselves but on the propaganda surrounding the events. In his study of the various Arabic traditions concerning 'Alī and Mu'āwiya, Petersen states that the narrators "worked eclectically and tendentiously; the polemic element is a most salient feature of both poetic and prose transmission, neither of which possesses first-hand knowledge of the events in which we are here concerned."<sup>231</sup> He asserts the near impossibility of reconstructing the historical events immediately following the death of 'Uthmān in 656 C.E..<sup>232</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> An example of the numerous studies devoted to discovering "what really happened" is that by Harald Motzki. In his *isnād-cum-matn* analysis of the different traditions dealing with the murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq, Motzki discovers a meager historical kernel and argues that there are no indications of exegetical, theological, or legal influences penetrating and corrupting the story. Harald Motzki, "The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some Maghāzī-Reports," in Motzki, *Biography*, 171.

<sup>231</sup> Erling L. Petersen, *'Alī and Mu'āwiya in Early Arabic Tradition* (Odense: Odense University Press, 1974), 187.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*

A complete and absolutely certain reconstruction of the historical development appears to be beyond the bounds of possibility; many elements within the general context and many episodes will remain unknown for ever, as they probably were to most people of their own time, too. A confrontation of the primary elements of the sources with one another will enable us to reveal their tendency and controversy, and, where practicable, we can test their concrete information by means of other, independent—Syrian and Byzantine—evidence. Only by systematic and strictly consistent criticism will it be possible to rid the sources of their afterrationalizations, and this is the only way by which to obtain a truer picture of the earliest Islam.

For Petersen, Islamic historical writing is essentially determined by external, religious, political, or social conditions. The writing is also characterized by afterrationalizations by way of constructions, in form or matter, or harmonization of the material.<sup>233</sup>

Tayeb El-Hibri also argues that the ‘Abbāsīd narratives were not intended originally to tell facts but rather to provide commentary on a certain political, religious, social, or cultural issue (This issue may have derived from a real and controversial historical episode). He points out that narrators writing before and during the era of al-Ṭabarī often intended to discuss the controversial results of a political, social, or moral point.<sup>234</sup> The narratives were “developing in response to momentous historical changes that were fundamentally altering the fortunes of the caliphal polity and pushing the Islamic community to raise some soul-searching questions about its role in the plot of history.”<sup>235</sup> El-Hibri adopts a literary-critical approach to reading the Islamic sources in his discovery of the motives and intentions that lay behind the composition of the narratives.

---

<sup>233</sup> Petersen, *‘Alī and Mu‘āwīya*, 186.

<sup>234</sup> Tayeb El-Hibri, *Reinterpreting Islamic Historiography: Hārūn al-Rashīd and the Narrative of the ‘Abbāsīd Caliphate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 13-14.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

### Badr Stories Selected for the Thesis and their Order for Analysis

Three stories have been selected from the biography of Muḥammad. The story of ‘Ātika’s vision was selected first, since the study at its outset sought to engage with the works of Jones and Wellhausen with regard to al-Wāqidī’s dependence upon Ibn Ishāq. The other two selections were made in light of Abbott’s observation that the material used by Jones was too small in scope for making a substantive determination concerning the issue of dependence.<sup>236</sup> The two selections were also made from the same larger *maghāzī* story as that of ‘Ātika’s vision in order that the material maintained a level of consistency in storyline. As a result, the two stories that were randomly selected from the same larger *maghāzī* story of the Battle of Badr were the council of war, in which Muḥammad sought advice from his followers on the way to Badr, and single combat, in which individual Muslims and polytheists dueled at the outset of the battle.<sup>237</sup> The three selections remained suitable as the study expanded to include the material ascribed to Mūsā and the material of Ibn Ishāq in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī.

In the following chapters, the order in which the stories are analyzed is: 1) The Council of War; 2) Single Combat; and 3) The Vision of ‘Ātika. In order to substantiate some of the findings, a further analysis that involves the rest of the Badr story is performed subsequent to the analysis of the three stories for the chapters on Ibn Ishāq (chap. 1), focusing on major changes to the material, and Mūsā (chap. 3), focusing on storyline divergences. This further analysis is not performed for the work of al-Wāqidī in chapter 2, for the question of al-Wāqidī’s dependence upon Ibn Ishāq is answered in the analysis of the three stories.

---

<sup>236</sup> See pages 26-27 of the present study.

<sup>237</sup> Included in the single combat story for this study is Ḥamza’s one-on-one encounter with al-Aswad.

## CHAPTER 1

## IBN ISHĀQ AND ALTERATION

The examination of the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī is in two parts. For the first part, each of the three Badr stories that have been selected for the study is divided into sections. For each section, the texts of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī are displayed. The texts are followed by a table of variants between the recensions and a discussion of the findings. The variants are of different kinds and are straightforwardly labeled: a word-variant is one in which the texts differ by a non-synonymous word, a phrase- or sentence-variant differs by a phrase or sentence,<sup>238</sup> and so on. For the second part of the analysis, which concerns the rest of the Badr story, the discoveries are accompanied by their relevant texts.

## Part 1

## The Council of War—Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>239</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>240</sup>
<p>News came to him [Muḥammad] about Quraysh's advance to protect their caravan. He consulted the people and told them about Quraysh. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq arose and spoke well. Then 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.</p> <p>Then al-Miqdād b. 'Amr arose and said, "O messenger of God, proceed as God has shown you, for we are with you. By God we will not say to you as the Israelites said to Moses, 'Go you and your Lord and fight, we will sit here,' but go you and your Lord and fight, we will fight with you. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you were to take us to Bark al-</p>	<p>News came to him [Muḥammad] about Quraysh's advance to protect their caravan. The Prophet consulted the people and told them about Quraysh. Abū Bakr, may God be pleased with him, arose and spoke well. Then 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.</p> <p>Then al-Miqdād b. 'Amr arose and said, "O messenger of God, proceed as God has commanded you, for we are with you. By God we will not say as the Israelites said to Moses, 'Go you and your Lord and fight, we will sit here,' but go you and your Lord and fight, we will fight with you. By Him who sent you with the</p>

<sup>238</sup> The size of phrase-variants varies and may be as small as a word; e.g., *bi-hi*. Also, the size of word-variants varies and may be as large as a phrase; e.g. *akfiyannakumūhu*. Nevertheless the distinction between words and phrases offers the most efficiency in the categorization of the variants.

<sup>239</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614-15.

<sup>240</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1300.

Ghimād, we would fight resolutely with you against them until you gained it.” The Prophet replied, “Well done,” and prayed for him.	truth, if you were to take us to Bark al-Ghimād, meaning the town in Abyssinia, we would fight resolutely with you against them until you gained it.” The Prophet replied, “Well done,” and prayed for blessings for him.
وأناه الخبر عن قريش بمسيرهم ليمنعوا غيرهم، فاستشار الناس، وأخبرهم عن قريش، فقام أبو بكر الصديق، فقال وأحسن. ثم قام عمر بن الخطاب، فقال وأحسن. ثم قام المقداد بن عمرو، فقال: يا رسول الله، امض لما أراك الله، فنحن معك، والله لا نقول لك كما قالت بنو إسرائيل لموسى: اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا ههنا <sup>241</sup> قاعدون. ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا معكم مقاتلون، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو سرت بنا إلى برك الغماد لجالدنا معك من دونه، حتى تبلغه، فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرا، ودعا له به.	وأناه الخبر عن قريش بمسيرهم ليمنعوا غيرهم، فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس، وأخبرهم عن قريش، فقام أبو بكر رضي الله عنه، فقال فأحسن. ثم قام عمر بن الخطاب، فقال فأحسن. ثم قام المقداد بن عمرو، فقال: يا رسول الله، امض لما أمرك الله، فنحن معك، والله لا نقول كما قالت بنو إسرائيل لموسى: اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا هاهنا قاعدون. ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا معكم مقاتلون، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو سرت بنا إلى برك الغماد يعني مدينة الحبشة لجالدنا معك من دونه، حتى تبلغه، فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرا، ودعا له بخير.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
1	فاستشار الناس	فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس
2	أبو بكر الصديق	أبو بكر رضي الله عنه
3	فقال وأحسن . . . فقال وأحسن	فقال فأحسن . . . فقال فأحسن
4	أراك	أمرك
5	لا نقول لك	لا نقول
6	برك الغماد	برك الغماد يعني مدينة الحبشة
7	ودعا له به	ودعا له بخير

There are some indications that the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī has been modified. The modifications are observable in the two kinds of variants found in the report of al-Miqdād’s counsel to the Prophet: 1) two word-variants: *arāka* vs. *amaraka* (4) [Ibn Hishām vs. al-Ṭabarī]; and *da‘ā la-hu bi-hi* vs. *da‘ā la-hu bi-khayri* (7); and 2) two phrase-variants: *la-ka* vs. not present (5); and not present vs. *ya‘nī madīnata l-ḥabshati* (6).

The phrase *ya‘nī madīnata l-ḥabshati* (6) in the account of al-Ṭabarī was most likely an insertion by a transmitter who was concerned to explain the whereabouts of Bark al-Ghimād.<sup>242</sup> Another edit seems to have been an alteration from *arāka* in Ibn

<sup>241</sup> Most likely a misprint in the Cairo edition. The edition by Wüstenfeld has هاهنا. Ibn Hishām, *Das Leben*, 1:434.

<sup>242</sup> Reportedly a place five night’s journey beyond Mecca towards the sea, or a town in the Yemen, or in the furthest part of the region of Hajar (eastern Arabia). William Montgomery Watt and M. V. McDonald, *Muḥammad at Mecca*, vol. 6, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 41.

Hishām to *amaraka* in al-Ṭabarī (4). In all probability, the editor took into consideration the figure of Moses who was famously known to have received orders by God to fight the Israelites’ enemies. As a result, the change from *arāka* (he has shown you) to the more fitting word *amaraka* (he has commanded you) would have transpired. A related concern which was prevalent during the early history of Islam was the hagiographic need to liken the figure of Muḥammad to Biblical characters, especially Moses and Jesus.<sup>243</sup> As regards the remaining two variants, *la-ka* vs. not present (5) and *da’ā la-hu bi-hi* vs. *da’ā la-hu bi-khayrin* (7), they appear to be an omission and addition that make for a smoother and clearer reading in the recension of al-Ṭabarī.

#### The Council of War—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>244</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>245</sup>
<p>Then the Prophet said, “Give me advice, O people,” meaning the Anṣār. This is because they are the majority of the people, and because when they had pledged allegiance to him at al-‘Aqaba, they said, “O messenger of God, we are exempt from protecting you until you reach our dwelling-places. But when you reach us, you will be under our protection. We will protect you from that which we protect our women and children.” The Prophet was afraid that the Anṣār were considering that they would not be an assistance to him except from what came upon him from his enemy in Medina, and that it was not their obligation to go with him against an enemy outside their territory.</p>	<p>Then the Prophet said, “Give me advice, O people,” meaning the Anṣār. This is because they were the majority of the people, and because when they had pledged allegiance to him at al-‘Aqaba, they said, “O messenger of God, we are exempt from protecting you until you reach our dwelling-place. But when you reach us, you will be under our protection. We will protect you from that which we protect our women and children.” The Prophet was afraid that the Anṣār were considering that they would not be an assistance to him except from what came upon him from his enemy in Medina, and that it was not their obligation to go with him against an enemy outside their territory.</p>
<p>ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ أيها الناس. وإنما يريد الأنصار، وذلك أنهم عدد الناس، وأنهم حين بايعوه بالعقبة، قالوا: يا رسول الله: إنا برآء من ذمامك، حتى تصل إلى ديارنا، فإذا وصلت إلينا، فأنت في ذمتنا، نمنعك ممّا نمنع منه أبناءنا ونساءنا. فكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، يتخوّف ألا تكون</p>	<p>ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ أيها الناس. وإنما يريد الأنصار، وذلك أنهم كانوا عدد الناس، وذلك أنهم حين بايعوه بالعقبة، قالوا: يا رسول الله: إنا برآء من ذمامك، حتى تصل إلى دارنا، فإذا وصلت إلينا، فأنت في ذمامنا، نمنعك ممّا نمنع منه أبناءنا ونساءنا. فكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم،</p>

<sup>243</sup> Rubin makes clear the concern within the Muslim literary sources to liken Muḥammad to Biblical characters in *The Eye of the Beholder*.

<sup>244</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>245</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1301.

الأنصار ترى عليها نصره إلا ممن دهمه بالمدينة من عدوه، وأن ليس عليهم أن يسير بهم إلى عدو من بلادهم.	يتخوف أن لا تكون الأنصار ترى عليها نصرته إلا ممن دهمه بالمدينة من عدوه، وأن ليس عليهم أن يسير بهم إلى عدو من بلادهم.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
8	عدد الناس	كانوا عدد الناس
9	ديارنا	دارنا
10	ذمتنا	ذممتنا
11	إلا	أن لا
12	نصره	نصرته

Grammatical improvement in al-Ṭabarī seems to have been the cause for one of the variants (8). This variant involves the description of the Anṣār as the majority of the people. In Ibn Hishām, the Anṣār as the people’s majority are described in the present tense. Contrastingly in al-Ṭabarī, the Anṣār are described in the past tense by virtue of an additional word, *kānū* (were). Seeing as the narrative of al-Ṭabarī runs more smoothly, it appears that a transmitter in the line of al-Ṭabarī—Salama, Ibn Ḥumayd or al-Ṭabarī—added the word *kānū* to improve upon the Ibn Ishāq-material. Be that as it may, another possible explanation for the variant is that *kānū* was dropped from the account of Ibn Hishām.

### The Council of War—Section 3

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>246</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>247</sup>
When the Prophet said that, Sa’d b. Mu’adh said to him, “By God, you seem to mean us, O messenger of God.” “Yes,” he replied. Sa’d said, “We have believed in you and have accepted what you say as true, and we have testified that the message you brought is the truth. We have accordingly given you our word and covenant to listen and obey. Proceed O messenger of God as you wish, for we are with you; and by Him who sent you with the truth, if you lead us to the sea and plunge into it, we would plunge into it with you; not one man among us would stay behind. We are not unwilling for you	When the Prophet said that, Sa’d b. Mu’adh said to him, “By God, you seem to mean us, O messenger of God.” “Yes,” he replied. Sa’d said, “We have believed in you and have accepted what you say as true, and we have testified that the message you brought is the truth. We have accordingly given you our word and covenant to listen and obey. Proceed O messenger of God as you wish. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you lead us to the sea and plunge into it, we would plunge into it with you; not one man among us would stay behind. We are not unwilling for you to meet the enemy

<sup>246</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>247</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1301-2.

<p>to meet the enemy with us tomorrow. We are steadfast in war, trustworthy in battle. Perhaps God intends for you something from us, that which will gladden you, so take us along with God's blessing."</p> <p>The Prophet was gladdened by Sa'd's reply, and it strengthened him. Then he said, "March, and rejoice, for God Most High has promised me one of the two parties, and by God it is as though I now see the places of slaughter of the people."</p>	<p>with us tomorrow. We are steadfast in war, trustworthy in battle. Perhaps God intends for you something from us, that which will gladden you, so take us along with God's blessing."</p> <p>The Prophet was gladdened by Sa'd's reply, and it strengthened him. Then he said, "March, with the blessing of God, and rejoice, for God has promised me one of the two parties, and by God it is as though I now see the places of slaughter of the people."</p>
<p>فلما قال ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال له سعد بن معاذ: والله لكأنك تريدنا يا رسول الله، قال: أجل. قال: فقد أمانا بك وصدقناك، وشهدنا أن ما جئت به هو الحق، وأعطيناك على ذلك عهدنا وموآثيقنا، على السمع والطاعة، فامض يا رسول الله لما أردت، فنحن معك، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو استعرضت بنا هذا البحر فخضته، لخضناه معك، ما تخلف منا رجل واحد، وما نكره أن تلقى بنا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر في الحرب، صدق في اللقاء. لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك، فسر بنا على بركة الله.</p> <p>فسر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقول سعد، ونشطه ذلك، ثم قال: سيروا وأبشروا، فإن الله تعالى قد وعدني إحدى الطائفتين، والله لكأني الآن أنظر إلى مصارع القوم.</p>	<p>فلما قال ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال له سعد بن معاذ: والله لكأنك تريدنا يا رسول الله، قال: أجل. قال: فقد أمانا بك وصدقناك، وشهدنا أن ما جئت به هو الحق، وأعطيناك على ذلك عهدنا وموآثيقنا، على السمع والطاعة، فامض يا رسول الله لما أردت، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، إن استعرضت بنا هذا البحر فخضته، لخضناه معك، ما تخلف منا رجل واحد، وما نكره أن تلقى بنا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر عند الحرب، صدق عند اللقاء. لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك، فسر بنا على بركة الله.</p> <p>فسر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقول سعد، ونشطه ذلك، ثم قال: سيروا على بركة الله وأبشروا، فإن الله قد وعدني إحدى الطائفتين، والله لكأني الآن أنظر إلى مصارع القوم.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
13	أردت فنحن معك	أردت
14	لو	إن
15	في	عند
16	في	عند
17	سيروا	سيروا على بركة الله
18	الله تعالى	الله

Intentional changes do not appear to have been made for this passage. Although the large size of two of the variants might make it seem that alterations were performed, a consideration of the differences discovers otherwise. In the first instance, the text of Ibn Hishām includes while the text of al-Ṭabarī does not the sentence (13): "We are with you" (*naḥnu ma'ka*). Secondly the account of al-Ṭabarī includes while that of Ibn Hishām does not the phrase (17): "with the blessing of God" (*'alā barakati llāhi*). In both cases, the two versions do not differ doctrinally, and neither version offers a superior reading.

## Single Combat—Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>248</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>249</sup>
<p>Al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī, who was a malicious, ill-natured man, stepped forth and said, “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern, or destroy it, or die without doing so.” When he came forth, Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib came forth to him. When the two met, Ḥamza struck him and cut off his foot and half his leg before he reached the cistern. Al-Aswad fell on his back with blood from his leg gushing towards his companions. Then he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it, intending to fulfill his oath, but Ḥamza followed him and struck him and killed him in the cistern.</p> <p>Then after him ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a stepped forth between his brother Shayba and his son al-Walīd b. ‘Utba, and when he stood clear of the ranks gave the challenge for single combat. Three men of the Anṣār came out against him, and they were ‘Awf and Mu‘awwidh, the sons of al-Ḥārith—their mother was ‘Afrā— and another man; he is said to have been ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa. Then they [Quraysh] asked, “Who are you?” And they answered, “Some of the Anṣār.” They [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”</p>	<p>Al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī, who was a malicious, ill-natured man, stepped forth and said, “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern and destroy it, or die without doing so.” When he came forth, Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib came forth against him. When the two met, Ḥamza struck him and cut off his foot and half his leg before he reached the cistern. Al-Aswad fell on his back with blood from his leg gushing towards his companions. Then he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it, intending—it is alleged—to fulfill his oath, but Ḥamza followed him and struck him and killed him in the cistern.</p> <p>Then after him ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a stepped forth between his brother Shayba and his son al-Walīd b. ‘Utba, and when he stood clear of the ranks gave the challenge for single combat. Three men of the Anṣār came out against him, from the troop: ‘Awf and Mu‘awwidh, the sons of al-Ḥārith—their mother was ‘Afrā— and another man, said to have been ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa. Then they [Quraysh] asked, “Who are you?” They answered, “Some of the Anṣār,” whereupon they [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”</p>
<p>وقد خرج الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي، وكان رجلاً شرساً سيء الخلق، فقال: أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته، أو لأموتنّ دونه، فلما خرج، خرج إليه حمزة بن عبد المطلب، فلما التقيا ضربه حمزة فأطنّ قدمه بنصف ساقه، وهو دون الحوض، فوقع على ظهره تشخب رجله دما نحو أصحابه، ثم حبا إلى الحوض، حتى اقتحم فيه، يريد أن يبرّ يمينه، وأتبعه حمزة فضربه، حتى قتله في الحوض.</p> <p>ثم خرج بعده عتبة بن ربيعة، بين أخيه شيبه بن ربيعة وابنه الوليد بن عتبة، حتى إذا فصل من الصف، دعا إلى المبارزة، فخرج إليه فتية من الأنصار ثلاثة، وهم: عوف، ومعوذ، ابنا الحارث – و أمهما عفراء – ورجل آخر، يقال: هو عبد الله بن رواحة، فقالوا: من أنتم؟ فقالوا: رهط من الأنصار، قالوا: ما لنا بكم من</p>	<p>وقد خرج الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي، وكان رجلاً شرساً سيئ الخلق، فقال: أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، و لأهدمته أو لأموتنّ دونه، فلما خرج، خرج له حمزة بن عبد المطلب، فلما التقيا ضربه حمزة فأطنّ قدمه بنصف ساقه، وهو دون الحوض، فوقع على ظهره تشخب رجله دما نحو أصحابه، ثم حبا إلى الحوض، حتى اقتحم فيه، يريد زعم أن يبرّ يمينه، وأتبعه حمزة فضربه، حتى قتله في الحوض.</p> <p>ثم خرج بعده عتبة ابن ربيعة، بين أخيه شيبه بن ربيعة وابنه الوليد بن عتبة، حتى إذا فصل من الصف، دعا إلى المبارزة، فخرج إليه فتية من الأنصار ثلاثة نفر منهم عوف، ومعوذ، ابنا الحارث – و أمهما عفراء – ورجل آخر، يقال له عبد الله بن رواحة، فقالوا: من أنتم؟ قالوا: رهط من الأنصار، فقالوا: ما لنا بكم من حاجة.</p>

<sup>248</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:624-25.

<sup>249</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1316-17.

حاجة		
	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
1	أو لأهدمنه	ولأهدمنه
2	إليه	له
3	أن	زعم أن
4	ثلاثة وهم	ثلاثة نفر منهم
5	يقال	يقال له
6	هو عبد الله بن رواحه	عبد الله بن رواحه
7	فقالوا	قالوا
8	قالوا	فقالوا

In the report of Ḥamza's slaying of al-Aswad, three instances in al-Ṭabarī appear to display modification. They involve a letter-variant: *aw* vs. *wa* (1) [Ibn Hishām vs. al-Ṭabarī]; a word-variant: not present vs. *za'ama* (3); and a synonym-variant: *ilayhi* vs. *la-hu* (2).

In regard to the first instance, the sentence in Ibn Hishām in which al-Aswad swore that he will surely drink from the cistern, destroy the cistern, or die is cumbersome. These three alternatives in reality do not make for sensible options. The sentence in al-Ṭabarī however offers a meaningful way of understanding al-Aswad's oath. By altering *aw* to *wa*, an editor would have corrected the awkward language, making understandable the options for al-Aswad to either destroy the cistern after drinking from it or die while trying.

The second instance of modification in al-Ṭabarī is the addition of the word *za'ama*. The editor would have realized that his alteration from *aw* to *wa* made it impossible for a fatally injured al-Aswad to destroy the cistern and thereby fulfill his oath. It seems that the editor therefore added the word *za'ama*, or "it is alleged," so as to discount the trustworthiness of the associated part of the narrative with the end goal of making the entire story sensible.

A final change possibly occurred from *ilayhi* to *la-hu* in order to smoothen the narrative in al-Ṭabarī. Since both usages of *ilayhi* and *la-hu* are fitting to the story however, it is also possible that no such change transpired.

## Single Combat—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>250</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>251</sup>
<p>Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith, and arise, O Ḥamza, and arise, O ‘Alī.” And when they arose and approached them, Quraysh asked, “Who are you?” ‘Ubayda replied, “‘Ubayda,” Ḥamza replied, “Ḥamza,” and ‘Alī replied, “‘Alī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.”</p> <p>‘Ubayda was the eldest of them, and he faced ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, while Ḥamza faced Shayba b. Rabī‘a and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd b. ‘Utba. As for Ḥamza, it was not long before he slew Shayba, and as for ‘Alī, it was not long before he slew al-Walīd. ‘Ubayda and ‘Utba exchanged blows and each maimed his opponent. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on ‘Utba with their swords and dispatched him. They [Ḥamza and ‘Alī] carried their companion [‘Ubayda] and united him with his friends.</p>	<p>Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and arise O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith, and arise, O ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.” And when they arose and approached them, Quraysh asked, “Who are you?” ‘Ubayda replied, “‘Ubayda,” Ḥamza replied, “Ḥamza,” and ‘Alī replied, “‘Alī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.”</p> <p>‘Ubayda was the eldest of them, and he faced ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, while Ḥamza faced Shayba b. Rabī‘a and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd b. ‘Utba. As for Ḥamza, it was not long before he slew Shayba, and as for ‘Alī, it was not long before he slew al-Walīd. ‘Ubayda and ‘Utba exchanged blows, and each maimed his opponent. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on ‘Utba with their swords and dispatched him. And so they killed him. They [Ḥamza and ‘Alī] carried their companion ‘Ubayda and brought him to his friends.</p>
<p>ثم نادي مناديهم: يا محمد، أخرج إلينا أكفائنا من قومنا، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: قم يا عبدة بن الحارث، وقم يا حمزة، وقم يا علي، فلما قاموا ودنوا منهم، قالوا: من أنتم؟ قال عبدة: عبدة، وقال حمزة: حمزة، وقال علي: علي، قالوا: نعم، أكفاء كرام. فبارز عبدة، وكان أسنَّ القوم، عتبة ربيعة،<sup>252</sup> وبارز حمزة شيبه بن ربيعة، وبارز علي الوليد بن عتبة. فأما حمزة فلم يمهل شيبه أن قتله، وأما علي فلم يمهل الوليد أن قتله، واختلف عبدة وعتبة بينهما ضربتين، كلاهما أثبت صاحبه، وكرَّ حمزة وعلي بأسيا فهما على عتبة فدقفا عليه فقتلاه واحتملا فحازاه إلى أصحابه.</p>	<p>ثم نادي مناديهم: يا محمد، أخرج إلينا أكفائنا من قومنا، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: قم يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب قم يا عبدة بن الحارث قم يا علي ابن أبي طالب، فلما قاموا ودنوا منهم، قالوا: من أنتم؟ قال عبدة: عبدة، وقال حمزة: حمزة، وقال علي: علي، قالوا: نعم، أكفاء كرام.</p> <p>فبارز عبدة بن الحارث، وكان أسنَّ القوم، عتبة بن ربيعة، وبارز حمزة شيبه بن ربيعة، وبارز علي الوليد بن عتبة. فأما حمزة فلم يمهل شيبه أن قتله، وأما علي فلم يمهل الوليد أن قتله، واختلف عبدة وعتبة بينهما ضربتين، كلاهما أثبت صاحبه، وكرَّ حمزة وعلي بأسيا فهما على عتبة فدقفا عليه فقتلاه واحتملا صاحبهما عبدة فجاء به إلى أصحابه.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
9	قم يا عبدة بن الحارث	قم يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب
10	وقم يا حمزة	قم يا عبدة بن الحارث
11	وقم يا علي	قم يا علي ابن أبي طالب
12	عبدة	عبدة بن الحارث

<sup>250</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625.

<sup>251</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1317-18.

<sup>252</sup> Most likely a misprint in the Cairo edition. The edition by Wüstenfeld has عتبة بن ربيعة. Ibn Hishām, *Das Leben*, 1:443.

13	واحتملا	فقتلاه واحتملا
14	صاحبهما	صاحبهما عبيدة
15	فحازاه	فجاءا
16	إلى أصحابه	به إلى أصحابه

Evidence that suggests that the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī was amended is the presence of an additional sentence. This sentence, *fa-qatalāhu* (Then they killed him), which is found exclusively in al-Ṭabarī (13), refers to the killing of ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a by both Ḥamza and ‘Alī. Previously stated is the sentence *fa-dhaffafā ‘alayhi*, or “Then they [Ḥamza and ‘Alī] dispatched him [‘Utba].”<sup>253</sup> This previous sentence may have had the effect of making unclear the killing of ‘Utba, but by adding *fa-qatalāhu*, the editor would have removed the ambiguity. It appears then that the additional sentence did not form part of the original wording of Ibn Ishāq but was inserted in order to explicate the narrative. Revealingly the addition interrupts the flow of the narrative.

Another addition appears to have been made. In this instance, the name ‘Ubayda, which is located in the final sentence of the passage, seems to have been added (14) in order to elucidate the object of the sentence.

#### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>254</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>255</sup>
Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ‘Ikrima from Ibn ‘Abbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and they both said: Three days before ḌamḌam arrived in Mecca, ‘Ātika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and she said, “O my brother, by God last night I saw a vision which frightened me and I am afraid that evil and misfortune will come upon your people, so keep what I	Ibn Ḥumayd related to me that Salama said that Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ‘Ikrima from Ibn ‘Abbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and he said: Three days before ḌamḌam arrived in Mecca, ‘Ātika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and she said, “O my brother, by God last night I saw a vision which frightened me and I am afraid that evil and misfortune will

<sup>253</sup> Edward William Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, s.v. "ذف."

<sup>254</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-8.

<sup>255</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1292-93.

tell you to yourself.” He asked, “What did you see?” She replied, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel. He halted in the valley and shouted at the top of his voice, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ I saw the people gather around him; then he went into the mosque with the people following him. While they were around him, his camel mounted to the top of the Ka’ba. Then he shouted the same words, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays, and he shouted the same thing. Then he took hold of a boulder, released it, and it began to fall. At the bottom of the mountain it shattered into pieces. There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling in Mecca that a piece did not enter.”

come upon your people, so keep what I tell you about it to yourself.” He asked, “What did you see?” She replied, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel. He halted in the valley and shouted at the top of his voice, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ I saw the people gather around him; then he went into the mosque with the people following him. While they were around him, his camel mounted to the top of the Ka’ba. Then he shouted the same words at the top of his voice, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays, and he shouted the same thing. Then he took hold of a boulder, released it, and it began to fall. At the bottom of the mountain it shattered into pieces. There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling among dwellings in Mecca that a piece did not enter.”

قال ابن إسحاق: فأخبرني من لا أتهم، عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس، ويزيد بن رومان، عن عروة بن الزبير، قال: وقد رأيت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب، قبل قدوم ضمضم مكة بثلاث ليال، رؤيا أفرعتها. فبعثت إلى أخيها العباس بن عبد المطلب، فقالت له: يا أخي، والله لقد رأيت الليلة رؤيا أفضعتني، وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة، فاکتم عني ما أحدثك به، فقال لها: وما رأيت؟ قالت: رأيت راكبا أقبيل على بعير له، حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته: ألا انفروا يا لغدر<sup>256</sup> لمصار عكم في ثلاث، فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه، فبينما هم حوله، مثل به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة، ثم صرخ بمثلها: ألا انفروا يا لغدر<sup>257</sup> لمصار عكم في ثلاث: ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس، فصرخ بمثلها. ثم أخذ صخرة فأرسلها. فأقبلت تهوى، حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارضت، فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة، ولا دار إلا دخلتها منها فلقة.

حدثنا ابن حميد قال حدثنا سلمة قال قال ابن إسحاق وحدثني من لا أتهم عن عكرمة مولى ابن عباس عن ابن عباس ويزيد بن رومان عن عروة قال: وقد رأيت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب قبل قدوم ضمضم مكة بثلاث ليال، رؤيا أفرعتها. فبعثت إلى أخيها العباس بن عبد المطلب، فقالت له: يا أخي، والله لقد رأيت الليلة رؤيا أفضعتني، وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة، فاکتم علي ما أحدثك. قال لها: وما رأيت؟ قالت: رأيت راكبا أقبيل على بعير له، حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته: ألا انفروا يال غدر لمصار عكم في ثلاث، فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه، فبينما هم حوله، مثل به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته بمثلها: ألا انفروا يال غدر لمصار عكم في ثلاث. ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس، فصرخ بمثلها. ثم أخذ صخرة فأرسلها. فأقبلت تهوى، حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارضت، فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة، ولا دار من دورها إلا دخلت منها فلقة.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
1	قالا	قال
2	عني	علي
3	أحدثك به	أحدثك
4	ألا	أن
5	يا لغدر	يال غدر

<sup>256</sup> Reported by the majority of the sources for the Cairo edition. See Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607n6. Differently, the edition by Wüstenfeld has يال غدر. Ibn Hishām, *Das Leben*, 1:428.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid.

6	فبينما	فبينما
7	ثم صرخ بمثلها: ألا	ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته بمثلها أن
8	يا لغدر	يال غدر
9	ولا دار إلا	ولا دار من دورها إلا

Two of the variants seem to have been the result of modifications performed by a transmitter in the line of al-Ṭabarī. The first variant involves the rider's repetition of his prophetic cry of the Meccans' destruction (7):

Then he shouted the same words (*thumma ṣarakha bi-mithlihā*), "Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days' time." [Ibn Hishām]

Then he shouted the same words at the top of his voice (*thumma ṣarakha bi-a'lā ṣawtihi bi-mithlihā*), "Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days' time." [Al-Ṭabarī]

The extra phrase in al-Ṭabarī, *bi-a'lā ṣawtihi*, appears to have been added as an adjustment, for the resultant sentence falls in line with the mode of the narrative—the phrase was utilized previously in both Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī in the same way:

He [Al-'Abbās] asked, "What did you see?" She replied, "I saw a rider coming upon a camel. He halted in the valley and shouted at the top of his voice (*bi-a'lā ṣawtihi*).

Altogether the version in al-Ṭabarī relates a more uniform and consistent account than the version in Ibn Hishām.

The second instance of modification is found later in the report as 'Ātika continues her narration. An extra phrase in al-Ṭabarī, *min dūrihā* (9), again brings about uniformity to the account:

*mā baqiya baytun min buyūtin makka wa-lā dār ilā dakhalathā minhā filqatun* (There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling in Mecca that a piece did not enter). [Ibn Hishām]

*mā baqiya baytun min buyūtin makka wa-lā dār min dūrihā ilā dakhalathā minhā filqatun* (There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling among dwellings in Mecca that a piece did not enter). [Al-Ṭabarī]

Although the uniformity in al-Ṭabarī suggests that his version underwent alteration, it is also possible that the phrases were dropped from Ibn Hishām's version.

## The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>258</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>259</sup>
<p>Al-‘Abbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-‘Abbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ‘Utba, and the story spread in Mecca until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings.</p> <p>Al-‘Abbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ‘Ātika’s vision. When Abū Jahl saw me he said, “O Abū al-Faḍl, when you have finished your circumambulation, come over to us.” When I finished, I went and sat with them, and Abū Jahl asked, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “That vision which ‘Ātika saw.” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: Then I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?! ‘Ātika claimed in her vision that someone said, ‘Come forth in three days’ time.’ We will wait these three days. If what she says is true, then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka‘ba among the Arabs.”</p>	<p>Al-‘Abbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-‘Abbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ‘Utba, and the story spread until Quraysh were talking about it.</p> <p>Al-‘Abbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ‘Ātika’s vision. When Abū Jahl saw me he said, “O Abū al-Faḍl, when you have finished your circumambulation, come over to us.” He said [Al-‘Abbās]: So when I finished, I went to him and sat with them. Abū Jahl asked, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “The vision that ‘Ātika saw.” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?! ‘Ātika claimed in her vision that someone said, ‘Come forth in three days’ time.’ We will wait these three days. If what she said is true, then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka‘ba among the Arabs.”</p>
<p>قال العباس: والله إن هذه لرؤيا، وأنت فاكتمتها، ولا تذكرها لأحد. ثم خرج العباس فلقى الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة، وكان له صديقا، فذكرها له، واستكتمه إياه، فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة، ففشا الحديث بمكة، حتى تحددت به قريش في أنديةها.</p> <p>قال العباس: فغدوت لأطوف بالبيت وأبو جهل بن هشام في رهط من قريش قعود، يتحدثون برويا عاتكة، فلما رأني أبو جهل قال: يا أبا الفضل، إذا فرغت من طوافك فاقبل إلينا، فلما فرغت أقبلت، حتى جلست</p>	<p>قال العباس: والله إن هذه لرؤيا، وأنت فاكتمتها، ولا تذكرها لأحد. ثم خرج العباس فلقى الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة، وكان له صديقا، فذكرها له، واستكتمه إياه، فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة، ففشا الحديث حتى تحددت به قريش.</p> <p>قال العباس: فغدوت أطوف بالبيت وأبو جهل بن هشام في رهط من قريش قعود، يتحدثون برويا عاتكة. فلما رأني أبو جهل قال: يا أبا الفضل، إذا فرغت من طوافك فاقبل إلينا. قال: فلما فرغت أقبلت إليه، حتى</p>

<sup>258</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-9.

<sup>259</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1293.

<p>معهم، فقال لي أبو جهل: يا بني عبد المطلب: متى حدثت فيكم هذه النبوة؟ قال: قلت: وما ذاك؟ قال: تلك رؤيا التي رأيت عاتكة، قال: فقلت: وما رأيت؟ قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن ينتبأ رجالكم حتى تنتبأ نساؤكم؟! قد زعمت عاتكة في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث، فسنتربص بكم هذه الثلاث، فإن يك حقاً ما تقول فسيكون، وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء، نكتب عليكم كتاباً أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.</p>	<p>جلست معهم. فقال لي أبو جهل: يا بني عبد المطلب: متى حدثت فيكم هذه النبوة؟ قال: قلت: وما ذاك؟ قال: الرؤيا التي رأيت عاتكة، قال: قلت: وما رأيت؟ قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن ينتبأ رجالكم حتى تنتبأ نساؤكم؟! قد زعمت عاتكة في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث، فسنتربص بكم هذه الثلاث، فإن يكن ما قالت حقاً فسيكون، وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء، نكتب عليكم كتاباً أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
10	فشا الحديث بمكة	فشا الحديث
11	قريش في أنديتها	قريش
12	لأطوف	أطوف
13	فلما	قال فلما
14	أقبلت	أقبلت إليه
15	تلك رؤيا	الرؤيا
16	فقلت	قلت
17	فإن يك حقاً ما تقول فسيكون	فإن يكن ما قالت حقاً فسيكون

A couple pieces of evidence that show that the Ibn Ishāq-material in al-Ṭabarī's recension was reconstructed involve the scene after 'Ātika shared the content of her vision with al-'Abbās. According to Ibn Hishām's recension, the story of her vision spread in Mecca (*fashā l-ḥadīthu bi-makka*) (10) until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings (*ḥattā taḥaddatha bi-hi quraysh fī andiytihā*) (11). In al-Ṭabarī's recension however, *bi-makka* and *fī andiytihā* are absent; as a result the account relates that the story spread (*fashā l-ḥadīthu*) until Quraysh were talking about it (*ḥattā taḥaddatha bi-hi quraysh*). These two phrases were omitted by an editor who sought to bring about corrections to the storyline. For according to the story, the vision of 'Ātika was being discussed by Quraysh the morning after 'Ātika had the vision. The length of one day however is too short for the story to have spread throughout Mecca. It is also impossible for a number of public meetings to have taken place in the length of a day. The editor must have realized the impossibility of both scenarios and consequently excised the problematic phrases.

The following report of the interaction between al-'Abbās and Abū Jahl involves a difference in word order and verbal tense: *fa-in yaki ḥaqqan mā taqūlu fa-sayakūnu* vs.

*fa-in yakun mā qālat haqqan fa-sayakūnu* (17). Here the account in al-Ṭabarī seems to have been changed, for the alteration of the verb *taqūlu* from its present to past tense, *qālat*, is fitting to the storyline which earlier was being narrated in the past tense. The order of the words in al-Ṭabarī also makes for a more lucid narrative.

### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 3

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>260</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>261</sup>
<p>He [Al-‘Abbās] said: By God, it was no great issue between us except that I contradicted that and denied that she had seen anything. Then we separated. When night came, there was not a woman from Banū al-Muṭṭalib who did not come to me. Each of them said, “Have you allowed this evil rascal [Abū Jahl] to attack your men and then go on with your women while you listened? Then you did not retaliate given what you heard?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “By God I have done so. It was no great issue between us, but I swear to God that I will confront him, and if he repeats what he said, then I will rid you of him.”</p> <p>On the third day after ‘Ātika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for which I wanted to get back at him. I went into the mosque and saw him. I walked towards him to confront him so that he could repeat some of what he had said so that I could attack him—he was a thin man with sharp features, a sharp tongue and a sharp glance. He [Al-‘Abbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said to myself, “What is the matter with him? God curse him. Is all this out of fear that I will revile him?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of ḌamḌam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel’s nose,</p>	<p>He [Al-‘Abbās] said: By God, it was no great issue between us except that I contradicted that and denied that she had seen anything. Then we separated. When night came, there was not a woman from Banū al-Muṭṭalib who did not come to me. Each of them said, “Have you allowed this evil rascal [Abū Jahl] to attack your men and then go on with your women while you listened? Then you did not retaliate given what you heard?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “By God I have done so. It was no great issue between us, but I swear to God that I will confront him, and if he repeats what he said, then I will rid you of him.”</p> <p>On the third day after ‘Ātika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for which I wanted to get back at him. I went into the mosque and saw him. I walked towards him to confront him so that he could repeat some of what he had said so that I could attack him—he was a thin man with sharp features, a sharp tongue and a sharp glance. Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-‘Abbās] said: And I said to myself, “What is the matter with him? God curse him. Is all this out of fear that I will revile him?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of ḌamḌam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel’s nose, turned his saddle</p>

<sup>260</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:609.

<sup>261</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1294-95.

<p>turned his saddle around, and torn his shirt, and he was saying, "O people of Quraysh, the caravan, the caravan! Your wealth is with Abū Sufyān, and Muḥammad and his companions have set out to intercept it. I do not think that you will reach it. Help! Help!" This diverted me from him, and he was diverted from me in our affair.</p>	<p>around, and torn his shirt, and he was saying, "O people of Quraysh, the caravan, the caravan! Your wealth is with Abū Sufyān, and Muḥammad and his companions have set out to intercept it. I do not think that you will reach it. Help! Help!" This diverted me from him, and he was diverted from me in our affair.</p>
<p>قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إليه كبير، إلا أني جددت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون رأيت شيئاً. قال: ثم تفرقنا فلما أمسيت، لم تبق امرأة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أتتني، فقالت: أقررتم لهذا الفاسق الخبيث أن يقع في رجالكم، ثم قد تناول النساء وأنت تسمع، ثم لم يكن عندك غير لشيء مما سمعت، قال: قلت: قد والله فعلت، ما كان مني إليه من كبير. وأيم الله لأتعرضن له، فإن عاد لأكفينكموه.</p> <p>قال: فغدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤيا عاتكة، وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى أني قد فاتتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه منه. قال: فدخلت المسجد فرأيت، فوالله إنني لأمشي نحوه أتعرضه، ليعود لبعض ما قال، فأقع به، وكان رجلاً خفيفاً، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان حديد النظر. قال: إذ خرج نحو باب المسجد يشتد. قال: فقلت في نفسي: ما له لعنه الله، أكل هذا فرق من أن أشاتمته! قال: وإذا هو قد سمع ما لم أسمع: صوت ضمضم بن عمرو الغفاري، وهو يصرخ ببطن الوادي واقفا على بعيره، قد جدع بعيره، وحول رحله، وشق قميصه، وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، اللطيمة اللطيمة، أموالكم مع أبي سفيان قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه، لا أرى أن تدركوها، الغوث الغوث. قال: فشغلني عنه، وشغله عني ما جاء من الأمر.</p>	<p>قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إليه كبير، إلا أني جددت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون رأيت شيئاً. قال: ثم تفرقنا فلما أمسيت، لم تبق امرأة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أتتني، فقالت: أقررتم لهذا الفاسق الخبيث أن يقع في رجالكم، ثم قد تناول النساء وأنت تسمع، ثم لم يكن عندك غير لشيء مما سمعت، قال: قلت: قد والله فعلت، ما كان مني إليه من كبير. وأيم الله لأتعرضن له، فإن عاد لأكفينكموه.</p> <p>قال: فغدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤيا عاتكة، وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى أني قد فاتتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه منه. قال: فدخلت المسجد فرأيت، فوالله إنني لأمشي نحوه أتعرضه، ليعود لبعض ما قال، فأقع به، وكان رجلاً خفيفاً، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان حديد النظر. إذ خرج نحو باب المسجد يشتد. قال: قلت في نفسي: ما له لعنه الله، أكل هذا فرق من أن أشاتمته! قال: وإذا هو قد سمع ما لم أسمع: صوت ضمضم بن عمرو الغفاري، وهو يصرخ ببطن الوادي واقفا على بعيره، قد جدع بعيره، وحول رحله، وشق قميصه، وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، اللطيمة اللطيمة، أموالكم مع أبي سفيان قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه، لا أرى أن تدركوها، الغوث الغوث. قال: فشغلني عنه، وشغله عني ما جاء من الأمر.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
18	لأكفينكموه	لأكفينكموه
19	أنى	أن
20	فقلت	قلت
21	مني	من

The variants for this passage are not only few in number but also do not appear to have been caused intentionally.

### Conclusion

The findings for all three stories have to do with the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī. For the council story, modifications seem to have been made to the Ibn Ishāq-material, and the hagiographic concern to idealize the figure of

Muḥammad may have played a role in one of the alterations. Modifications were also made in a few instances for the single combat story. As regards the story of ‘Ātika’s vision, the storyline in two locations was reconstructed seeing as it related an impossible sequence of events.

Altogether, the variants account for approximately 1% of the council story, 10%, of the single combat story, and 3.5% of the story of ‘Ātika’s vision. The remainder of each story—99%, 90%, and 96.5%, respectively—is identical. And since the amendments, modifications and reconstructions occurred in the account of al-Ṭabarī, the account in Ibn Hishām for the three stories more plausibly reflects the original words of Ibn Ishāq.

## Part 2

The variants for the entire Badr story in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī are listed and numbered in a table at the end of the analysis.<sup>262</sup> The table shows that the large majority of the reports by Ibn Ishāq and the order in which they are arranged are the same in the two recensions.

As for the differences, the reports in al-Ṭabarī that are not found in Ibn Hishām are (The number corresponds to the report’s location within the table of variants):

1. The martyrdom of ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith (152)
2. The poem of ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥumām (171)
3. The burial of Abū Lahab (342)
4. Al-‘Abbās in prison (343)
5. The capture of al-‘Abbās (344)
6. The ransom of al-‘Abbās (362)
7. The excusal of Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh from a purported punishment (484)

Already mentioned was Ibn Hishām’s omission of three of the reports (343, 344, 362) due to his pro-‘Abbāsīd bias.<sup>263</sup> With regard to the other four reports, it is unclear why they are not present in his recension. They do not appear to be marked by tendentiousness.

<sup>262</sup> The table is found on pages 73-100 of the present study.

<sup>263</sup> See page 20 of the present study.

Alternatively, the Ibn Ishāq-material in Ibn Hishām that is not found in al-Ṭabarī consists mainly of poems, sixteen in total.<sup>264</sup> The poems usually redound to the glory of an individual Muslim warrior. An example is the poem ascribed to al-Mujadhdhar (205), who is reported to have killed Abū al-Bakhtarī:

Did you not know or did you forget my lineage?  
 Take note of my lineage, that I am from Balī,  
 those who thrust with Yazanī spears,  
 striking the chief until he is leaned over.  
 Tell the orphan, the one whose father is al-Bakhtarī,  
 or tell the same to my son.  
 I am he of whom it is said my origin is Balī.  
 I thrust my spear until it bends.  
 I kill my opponent with a sharp Mashrafī sword.  
 I am ready for death like a camel overfull with milk.  
 You will not see Mujadhdhar telling a lie.

A poem may also be attributed to a Meccan enemy such as Abū Jahl (239), who is presented as uttering while fighting:<sup>265</sup>

What does an endless war detest about me,  
 a young he-camel with gleaming teeth?  
 For such as this my mother bore me.

The other fourteen poems are:

1. The poem of Mikraz b. Ḥafs about his slaying of ‘Āmir (27)
2. The poem of Ṭālib b. Abī Ṭālib (87)
3. The poem of Ṭulayḥa b. Khuwaylid al-Asadī concerning his slaying of ‘Ukkāsha (257)
4. The poem of Ḥassān b. Thābit (270)
5. A poem by a *Rajaz* poet of the Muslims (296)
6. The poem of Mālik b. al-Dukhshum (357)
7. The poem of Mikraz (361)
8. Ḥassān b. Thābit’s answer to Abū Sufyān (374)
9. The poem of the affair of Zaynab (419)
10. The poem of Hind d. ‘Utba (420)
11. The poem of Kināna b. al-Rabī (421)

<sup>264</sup> Of prose and poetry, Wansbrough depicts them as conspicuous, attention-grabbing, and as having stylistic value based upon their location within the narrative. He says that poetry categorized as forensic or liturgical expression served to entertain and to underline; poetry, allegedly recited at, composed for, or inspired by the battle, was appended in order to commemorate the event. Poetry can also be of structural value. Concerning Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, Wansbrough states that al-Wāqidī’s display of a more disciplined use of verse than Ibn Ishāq reveals their unique aims: “the *Sīra* is not merely a biography of the prophet of Islam; it is also an anthology of Arabian lore.” John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 38-39.

<sup>265</sup> According to Guillaume, the authenticity of such poetry is suspect: “What Ibn Hisham says about the poetry of those who took part in the battle of Badr . . . casts grave doubt on the authenticity of a large section of the poetry of the *Sīra*.” Guillaume, introduction to *Life of Muḥammad*, xxv.

12. Ḥassān b. Thābit's poem concerning Ṣayfī b. Abī Rifā'a (437)
13. The poem of Abū 'Azza (439)
14. Another poem of Ḥassān b. Thābit (483)

The absence of the sixteen poems from al-Ṭabarī's recension seems to be of little significance with regard to tendentiousness.<sup>266</sup> It appears simply that a transmitter in the line of al-Ṭabarī maintained an inclination to ignore poetic material.

Other than the poems, there are ten reports in the text of Ibn Hishām that are not included in the text of al-Ṭabarī:

1. The cause of war between Quraysh and Banū Bakr (26)
2. The detailed procession of the Muslims to Badr (32)
3. The Muslims' route to Badr and their confrontation with a nomad (33)
4. Abū Usayd's knowledge of the location from where the angels emerged (234)
5. Muḥammad's miraculous turning of a stick into a sword for 'Ukkāsha (256)
6. Muḥammad's prayer for 'Ukkāsha; 'Ukkāsha as the best Muslim horseman (258)
7. The sword al-Marzubān as booty (285)
8. Muḥammad's order to burn two men with fire (422)
9. The freedom without payment of some Meccan prisoners (436)
10. God's words concerning the devil in the form of Surāqa (482)

All except two reports (The sword al-Marzubān as booty and Muḥammad's order to burn two men with fire) exhibit no discernable reason for their exclusive inclusion in Ibn Hishām's recension. They seem neither to cause difficulties to the Badr narrative nor to promote any significant bias.

As for the report concerning the sword al-Marzubān, it appears to have been omitted from the recension of al-Ṭabarī. According to the report, Muḥammad ordered the Muslims to turn in whatever booty they had taken (285):

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>267</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
Ibn Ishāq said: 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr told me that Mālik b. Rabī'a one of Banū Sā'ida	Not present

<sup>266</sup> A case for the omission of the poems could be made if the poems redounded to the glory of the Meccans. Kister makes clear the grounds for the non-transmittal of adversarial poetry: "The reason why the transmission of poetry was forbidden was the fact that it served to excite inter-tribal discussions and disunity. The libelous and defamatory verses which might threaten the peaceful relations in Islamic society were dangerous and harmful. Such poetry was censured and rejected. But poetry supporting the Prophet and his struggle against the Unbelievers and verses written for the cause of Islam were, of course, praiseworthy. . . There was thus good poetry, which was permitted and which the Prophet even sometimes recited, and bad poetry, which was forbidden." M. J. Kister, "Poetry in the Sīrah Literature," in Beeston, 359.

<sup>267</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:642.

<p>from Abū Usayd al-Sā'idī said: "I got a sword belonging to Banū 'Ā'idh the Makhzūmite which was called al-Marzubān on the day of Badr. When the Prophet ordered the people to turn in what booty they had taken, I came and threw it in with the spoils." The Prophet did not hold back anything he was asked for, and al-Arḡam b. Abī al-Arḡam knew this. He asked the Prophet for it, and he gave it to him.</p>	
<p>قال ابن اسحاق: وحدثني عبد الله بن أبي بكر، قال: حدثني بعض بني ساعدة عن أبي أسيد الساعدي، مالك بن ربيعة، قال: أصبت سيف بني عائذ المخزوميين، الذي يسمى المرزبان، يوم بدر، فلما أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس أن يردوا ما في أيديهم من النفل، أقبلت حتى ألقيته في النفل. قال: وكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لا يمنع شيئاً سنله، فعرف الأرقم بن أبي الأرقم، فسأله رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فأعطاه إياه.</p>	

Muḥammad's order however is contradicted by his earlier promise to the Muslims that they could keep all the booty they took. This promise is found in two locations in al-Ṭabarī (169, 278):

<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>268</sup></p> <p>Ibn Ishāq said: Mihja' the <i>mawlā</i> of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was hit by an arrow and was killed. He was the first among the Muslims to be killed. Then while Ḥāritha b. Surāqa, one of Banū 'Adī b. al-Najjār, was drinking from the cistern, he was hit by an arrow in the throat and was killed. He [Ibn Ishāq] said: Then the Prophet went out to the people and incited them saying: "By Him in whose hand is the soul of Muḥammad, no man who fights today who is killed fighting courageously and with resignation, advancing and not retreating, will not be stopped by God from entering Paradise." . . .</p> <p>Then the Prophet ordered that what the men gathered in the camp be brought together. The Muslims disagreed concerning that. Those who had collected something said, "It is ours." But those who were fighting and pursuing</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)<sup>269</sup></p> <p>He [Ibn Ishāq] said: Mihja' the <i>mawlā</i> of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was hit by an arrow and was killed. He was the first among the Muslims to be killed. Then while Ḥāritha b. Surāqa, one of Banū 'Adī b. al-Najjār, was drinking from the cistern, he was hit by an arrow and was killed. Then the Prophet went out to the people and incited them. He promised every man that he could keep all the booty he took (<i>wa naffala kulla imra'in minhum mā aṣāba</i>). He said, "By Him in whose hand is the soul of Muḥammad, no man who fights today who is killed fighting courageously and with resignation, advancing and not retreating, will not be stopped by God from entering Paradise." . . .</p> <p>Then the Prophet ordered that what the men gathered in the camp be brought together. The Muslims disagreed concerning that. Those who had</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>268</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:627, 641.

<sup>269</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1321, 1333.

<p>the enemy said, “By God if it had not been for us, you would not have taken it, for we occupied the enemy from you while you took what you took.” . . .</p>	<p>collected something said, “It is ours. The Prophet had promised that we could keep what we took (<i>qad kāna rasūlu llāhu ṣallā llāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallam naffala kulla imra’in minhum mā aṣāba</i>).” But those who were fighting and pursuing the enemy said, “If it had not been for us, you would not have taken it, for we occupied the enemy from you while you took what you took.” . . .</p>
<p>قال ابن إسحاق: وقد رمى مهجع، مولى عمر بن الخطاب، بسهم فقتل، فكان أول قتل من المسلمين، ثم رمى حارثة بن سراقة، أحد بنى عدى بن النجار، وهو يشرب من الحوض، فأصاب نحره، فقتل. قال: ثم خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى الناس فحرضهم، وقال: والذي نفس محمد بيده، لا يقاتلهم اليوم رجل فيقتل صابرا محتسبا، مقبلا غير مدبر، إلا أدخله الله الجنة. . . .</p> <p>ثم إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أمر بما في العسكر، مما جمع الناس، فجمع، فاختلف المسلمون فيه، فقال من جمعه: هو لنا، وقال الذين كانوا يقاتلون العدو ويطلبونه: والله لو لا نحن ما أصبتموه، لنحن شغلنا عنكم القوم حتى أصبتم ما أصبتم. . .</p>	<p>قال: وقد رمى مهجع، مولى عمر بن الخطاب، بسهم فقتل، فكان أول قتل من المسلمين، ثم رمى حارثة ابن سراقة، أحد بنى عدى بن النجار، وهو يشرب من الحوض فقتل. ثم خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى الناس فحرضهم، ونفل كل امرئ منهم ما أصاب. وقال: والذي نفس محمد بيده، لا يقاتلهم اليوم رجل فيقتل صابرا محتسبا، مقبلا غير مدبر، إلا أدخله الله الجنة. . . .</p> <p>ثم إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أمر بما في العسكر، مما جمع الناس، فجمع، فاختلف المسلمون فيه، فقال من جمعه: هو لنا قد كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نفل كل امرئ ما أصاب، فقال الذين كانوا يقاتلون العدو ويطلبونهم لو لا نحن ما أصبتموه، لنحن شغلنا القوم عنكم حتى أصبتم ما أصبتم. . .</p>

Thus the report of Muḥammad’s order to turn in the spoils was omitted from al-Ṭabarī’s recension in order to avoid a contradiction. As a result, Muḥammad’s promise to the Muslims that they could retain their spoils was kept, for it never took place that he later ordered the Muslims to hand them in. In effect, the reconstruction elevated the figure of the Prophet by taking away from him the characterization of a promise-breaker.

The contradiction also led to an omission from the recension of Ibn Hishām. In this case, Muḥammad’s promise that the Muslims could keep their spoils was omitted. So since it never occurred that the Prophet gave his word that the Muslims could keep the spoils they took, he broke no promise when he ordered the Muslims to hand them in. Again, the reconstruction circumvents the Prophet being featured as a promise-breaker.

Hagiographic concerns also appear to have resulted in the omission of the report of Muḥammad’s order to burn two men with fire (422) from al-Ṭabarī’s recension.

As the story goes, the Prophet ordered the burning of two men, of whom one was

Habbār b. al-Aswad:

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>270</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
<p>Ibn Ishāq—Yazīd b. Abū Ḥaīb—Bukayr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ashajj—Sulaymān b. Yasār—Abū Ishāq al-Dawsī—Abū Hurayra: The Prophet dispatched a raiding party, and I was among it, and he said to us, “If you seize Habbār b. al-Aswad or the man who first got to Zaynab with him, then burn both of them with fire.” When the next day came, he sent to us, and said, “I had ordered you with the burning of these two men if you got hold of them; then I considered that no one has the right to punish by fire except for God, so if you capture them, kill them.”</p>	<p>Not present</p>
<p>قال ابن اسحاق: حدثني يزيد بن أبي حبيب، عن بكير بن عبد الله بن الأشج، عن سليمان بن يسار، عن أبي إسحاق الدوسي، عن أبي هريرة، قال: بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سرية أنا فيها، فقال لنا: إن ظفرتم بهتار ابن الأسود، أو الرجل الذي سبق معه إلى زينب فحرقوهما بالنار. قال: فلما كان الغد بعث إلينا، فقال: إني كنت أمرتكم بتحريق هذين الرجلين إن أخذتموهما، ثم رأيت أنه لا ينبغي لأحد أن يعذب بالنار إلا الله، فإن ظفرتم بهما فاقتلوهما.</p>	

The report portrays Muḥammad poorly given that he changed his mind on account of pronouncing a judgment reserved by God. By omitting this report, an editor in the line of al-Ṭabarī would have removed the profane conduct from the figure of Muḥammad.

A final variation in the form of a sentence-variant shows that another omission was performed out of hagiographic concerns. According to the recension of al-Ṭabarī, the Prophet drank water from a foul source, a spring called al-Arwāq (297). The spring was located by two mountains called Musliḥ and Mukhri’, both meaning “defecating,” and Muḥammad had beforehand drew a bad omen when told the names of their inhabitants, Banū al-Nār (Fire) and Banū Ḥurāq (Burning). The absence in Ibn Hishām of the Prophet’s consumption of the foul water was most likely intended. This omission would have had the effect of characterizing Muḥammad as free from contamination:

<sup>270</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:657.

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>271</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) <sup>272</sup>
<p>Then the Prophet advanced, and when he came out of the pass of al-Ṣafrā' he descended on a sand dune called Sayar between the pass and al-Nāziya beside a <i>sarḥ</i> tree. He divided equally the booty that God had granted the Muslims from the polytheists. Then the Prophet proceeded, and when he was at al-Rawḥā', the Muslims met him, congratulating him and the Muslims with him for the victory God had given him.</p>	<p>Then the Prophet advanced, and when he came out of the pass of al-Ṣafrā' he descended on a sand dune called Sayar between the pass and al-Nāziya beside a <i>sarḥ</i> tree. He divided equally the booty that God had granted the Muslims from the polytheists. He drank from the water there called al-Arwāq (<i>wa istaqā la-hu min mā' bi-hi yuqālu la-hu al-arwāq</i>). Then the Prophet proceeded, and when he was at al-Rawḥā', the Muslims met him, congratulating him and the Muslims with him for the victory God had given him.</p>
<p>ثم أقبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – حتى إذا خرج من مضيق الصّفراء نزل على كئيب بين المضيق وبين النازية – يقال له: سير – إلى سرحة به. فقسّم هنالك الثّقل الذي أفاء الله على المسلمين من المشركين على السواء، ثم ارتحل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، حتى إذا كان بالزّوجاء لقيه المسلمون يهنّئونه بما فتح الله عليه ومن معه من المسلمين.</p>	<p>ثم أقبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – حتى إذا خرج من مضيق الصّفراء نزل على كئيب بين المضيق وبين النازية – يقال له: سير – إلى سرحة به. فقسّم هنالك الثّقل الذي أفاء الله على المسلمين من المشركين على السواء، واستقى له من ماء به يقال له الأرواق، ثم ارتحل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، حتى إذا كان بالزّوجاء لقيه المسلمون يهنّئونه بما فتح الله عليه ومن معه من المسلمين.</p>

In sum, while the large majority of the reports by Ibn Ishāq are the same in the texts of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī, a significant number of reports that are included in one Badr narrative are not found in the other. Most of these reports exhibit no apparent reason for their inclusion or exclusion. Nevertheless, political interests affected the recension of Ibn Hishām, and a disinclination for poetry seems to have affected the recension of al-Ṭabarī. Most significantly, the storyline in both recensions was reconstructed out of the hagiographic impetus to idealize the important figure of Muḥammad.

#### Table of Variants

The table consists of all the instances in which the Ibn Ishāq-material differs between the texts of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī for the story of the Battle of Badr. For the locations in which only one narrative is extant, an English translation is provided.

<sup>271</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:643.

<sup>272</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1335.

Also supplied are headings that denote the various smaller stories or poems within the Badr narrative. For the sake of comprehensiveness, the variants of the previously analyzed three stories are reproduced and placed in their appropriate chronological location.

The Battle of Badr		
	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)
	Muḥammad's Summon of the Muslims to Attack the Meccan Caravan Led by Abū Sufyān <sup>273</sup>	
1	ثلاثون رجلا	ثلاثون ركبا
2	وائل بن هشام	وائل بن هشام بن سعيد بن سهم
3	فيستنفرهم	يستنفرهم
	The Vision of 'Ātika <sup>274</sup>	
4	قالا	قال
5	عني	علي
6	أحدثك به	أحدثك
7	إلا	أن
8	يا لغدر	يال لغدر
9	فبينما	فبينما
10	ثم صرخ بمثلها إلا	ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته بمثلها أن
11	يا لغدر	يال لغدر
12	ولا دار إلا	ولا دار من دورها إلا
13	فشا الحديث بمكة	فشا الحديث
14	قريش في أنديتها	قريش
15	لأطوف	أطوف
16	فلما	قال فلما
17	أقبلت	أقبلت إليه
18	تاك رؤيا	الرؤيا
19	فقلت	قلت
20	فإن يك حقا ما تقول فسيكون	فإن يكن ما قالت حقا فسيكون
21	لأكفيكنه	لأكفيكنموه
22	أني	أن
23	فقلت	قلت
24	مني	من
	The Preparation of Quraysh in Mecca and the State of War between Quraysh and Banū Bakr <sup>275</sup>	
25	ذكروا ما كان بينهم	ذكروا ما بينهم
	The Cause of War between Quraysh and Banū Bakr <sup>276</sup>	
26	The war between Quraysh and Banū Bakr, according to what one of Banū 'Āmir b. Lu'ayy from Muḥammad b. Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab told me, had to do	

<sup>273</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:606-7; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1291-92.

<sup>274</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-9; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1292-95.

<sup>275</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:610; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1296.

<sup>276</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:610-11.

with a son of Ḥafṣ b. al-Akhyaf, one of Banū Maʿīṣ b. ʿĀmir b. Luʿayy. He had gone out in search of his lost camel in Ḍajnān. He was a young man with flowing locks on his head, wearing a suit of clothes; he was a clean, radiant youth. He passed by ʿĀmir b. Yazīd b. ʿĀmir b. al-Mulawwiḥ, one of Banū Yaʿmar b. ʿAwf b. Kaʿb b. ʿĀmir b. Layth b. Bakr b. ʿAbd Manāt b. Kināna in Ḍajnān. He [ʿĀmir] was the chief of Banū Bakr in that day. When he saw him, he took an interest in him and asked, “Who are you O young man?” He replied, “I am the son of Ḥafṣ b. al-Akhyaf of Quraysh.” When the young man had gone away, ʿĀmir b. Yazīd said, “O Banū Bakr, is there not blood between you and Quraysh?” They replied, “Indeed by God, there is blood between us.” He said, “A man who kills this youth in revenge for his own man will have exacted the blood due to him.” So a man from Banū Bakr followed him and killed him for the blood that was due to him from Quraysh. Quraysh discussed it. ʿĀmir b. Yazīd said, “O people of Quraysh, you had blood outstanding with us, so what do you want? If you wish, then pay us what you owe us, and we will pay you what we owe you. If you rather want blood, man for man, then ignore what we owe you, and we will ignore what you owe us.” That youth was of little significance to this clan of Quraysh, so they said, “Agreed, man for man,” and paid no attention to him [the youth] and did not demand anything concerning him.

His brother Mikraz b. Ḥafṣ was traveling in Marr al-Zahrān when suddenly he saw ʿĀmir b. Yazīd b. ʿĀmir b. al-Mulawwiḥ on a camel. When he saw him, he came towards him and made his camel kneel beside him. ʿĀmir was wearing a sword, and Mikraz brought his sword down on him and killed him. Then he plunged his sword into his belly and brought it back to Mecca and hung it at night on the curtains of the Kaʿba. In the

	<p>morning, Quraysh saw the sword of ‘Āmir b. Yazīd b. ‘Āmir hanging on the curtains of the Ka’ba and recognized it. They said, “This is the sword of ‘Āmir b. Yazīd. Mikraz b. Ḥafṣ has attacked him and killed him.” And that was their affair, and while they were involved in that war, Islam brought about a separation among the people, and they were occupied with that until Quraysh gathered to go to Badr. Then they remembered what was between them and Banū Bakr, and they were afraid of them.</p>	
	<p>The Poem of Mikraz b. Ḥafṣ about his Slaying of ‘Āmir<sup>277</sup></p>	
27	<p>When I saw that it was ‘Amir, I remembered the lifeless corpse of my dear brother. I said to myself, “It is ‘Amir, do not fear, and discern what to pursue.” I was certain that if I struck a blow with the sword, he would perish. I let down on him, a courageous man, as my chest weighed heavy from emptiness, with an experienced sword. When we enclosed, between my fear and his fear, I did not show myself as an ignoble offspring of a woman but of no father. I let go my hurt, the air was no longer of vengeance, when not forgetting vengeance is what all do.</p>	
	<p>The Guarantee by Iblīs in the Form of Surāqa b. Mālīk that Banū Kināna will not Attack the Meccans from the Rear<sup>278</sup></p>	
28	سراقه بن مالك	سراقه
29	فقال لهم	فقال
30	لكم جار	جار لكم
31	كنانة من خلفكم	كنانة
	<p>The Procession of the Muslims to Badr<sup>279</sup></p>	
32	<p>He [Muḥammad] handed over the standard to Mūṣ‘ab b. ‘Umayr b. Hāshim b. ‘Abd Manāf b. ‘Abd al-Dār. In front of the Prophet were two black flags, one with ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib called al-‘Uqāb and the other with one of the Anṣār. On that day the companions of</p>	<p>The Prophet went out with his companions . . . He proceeded . . .</p>

<sup>277</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:611-12.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, 612; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1296.

<sup>279</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:612-13; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1299.

	<p>the Prophet had seventy camels which they took turns riding. The Prophet, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and Marthad b. Abī Marthad al-Ghanawī took turns on one camel; Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Zayd b. Ḥāritha, Abū Kabsha, and Anasa, <i>mawlā</i> of the Prophet, took turns on another camel; and Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. ‘Awf on one camel.</p>	
	<p>The Muslims’ Route to Badr and their Confrontation with a Nomad<sup>280</sup></p>	
33	<p>He took the mountainous road from Medina to Mecca; then he went through al-‘Aqīq, Dhū al-Ḥulayfa, and Ūlāt al-Jaysh. Then he passed Turbān, Malal, and Ghamīs al-Ḥamām from Marayayn; then Ṣukhayrāt al-Yamām, Sayāla; then the passage [between the mountains] of al-Rawḥā’, and Shanūka, which is the direct route, until at ‘Irq al-Zabya they met a man from among the Arabs. They asked him about Quraysh, but did not find that he had news. The people said, “Salute the Prophet.” He asked, “Do you have the messenger of God with you? They replied, “Yes, salute him.” Then he said, “If you are the messenger of God, then tell me what is in the belly of my she-camel here.” Salama b. Salāma b. Waqsh said to him, “Don’t question the Prophet, but come over to me and I will tell you about that. You leapt upon her and in her belly is a baby goat from you!” The Prophet said, “Enough! You have spoken obscenely to the man.” Then he turned away from Salama.</p> <p>The Prophet stopped at Sajsaj, which is the well of al-Rawḥā’; he departed from it and when he was at al-Musanṣaraf, he left the Meccan road on the left and went to the right to al-Nāziya, making for Badr. He entered its area and crossed a <i>wādī</i> called Ruḥqān, which is between al-Nāziya and the pass of al-Ṣafrā’; then he went on the pass. Afterwards, he set forth from it.</p>	

<sup>280</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:613.

Muḥammad's Dispatch of Scouts and his Evil Omen at Ṣafrā <sup>281</sup>	
34	وقالوا للآخر
35	فتركهما
36	فخرج منه حتى إذا كان ببعضه نزل
The Council of War <sup>282</sup>	
37	فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس
38	أبو بكر رضي الله عنه
39	فقال فأحسن . . . فقال فأحسن
40	أمرك
41	لا نقول لك
42	برك الغمام يعني مدينة الحبشة
43	ودعا له بخير
44	كانوا عدد الناس
45	دارنا
46	ذممتنا
47	ألا
48	نصرته
49	أردت فنحن معك
50	إن
51	عند
52	عند
53	سيروا على بركة الله
54	الله
Muḥammad's Inquiry of an Old Bedouin Man of the Whereabouts of Quraysh and the Muslims <sup>283</sup>	
55	انحط منها إلى
56	وذاك
57	صدقني
58	فهو
59	حدثني
60	به
The Muslims' Capture and Interrogation of the Water-Carriers of Quraysh <sup>284</sup>	
61	له الخبر
62	رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قائم يصلي
63	فسألوها
64	سجدتين
65	أخبراني أين قریش
66	هم
67	فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لهما
68	ما
69	قال لهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
Basbas and Adīy's Discovery of the Caravan's Time of Arrival at Badr and Abū Sufyān's Discovery of the Muslims' Presence <sup>285</sup>	
69	وقد كان
70	أخذا شئنا

<sup>281</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1299-1300.

<sup>282</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614-15; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1300-1302.

<sup>283</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:616; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1303.

<sup>284</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:616-17; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1303-4.

<sup>285</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:617-18; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1305.

71	أبو سفيان بن حرب	أبو سفيان
72	حتى تقدم	قد تقدم
73	قد أناخا	أناخا
The Dream of Juhaym and Abū Jahl's Determination to Reach Badr <sup>286</sup>		
74	قد أقبل	أقبل
75	بن هشام	ابن هشام
76	يوم بدر	يومئذ
77	نضح	نضح
78	الخمير	الخمور
79	العرب وبمسيرنا وجمعنا	العرب
80	أبدا بعدها	أبدا
81	فاجعلوا لي	فاجعلوا بي
82	لا حاجة لكم بأن	لا حاجة بكم في أن
83	أطاعوه وكان	وكان
84	وكان	قال وقد كان
85	لمع	مع
86	مع من رجع	فيمن رجع
The Poem of Ṭalīb b. Abī Ṭalīb <sup>287</sup>		
87	O God, if Ṭalīb goes forth to war among the troops belligerently, as a horseman among the horsemen, let him be the plundered not the plunderer, the defeated not the defeater.	
God's Sending of Rain which Restricts the Movement of Quraysh <sup>288</sup>		
88	عن السير	المسير
The Muslims' Stopping Up of the Wells and their Construction of Muḥammad's Booth <sup>289</sup>		
89	أمنزلا	أمنزل
90	نتأخر عنه	نتأخر
91	ليس	ليس لك
92	نأتى ... فننزله ثم نغور ... نبنى ... فنملؤه	تأتى ... فتنزله ثم تعورا ... نبنى ... فتملاه
93	ما وراءه	ما سواه
94	حتى إذا	حتى
95	نزل	فنزل
96	نبي الله	رسول الله
97	ألا نبنى	نبنى
98	عريشا تكون	عريشا من جريد فتكون
99	ما	مما
100	وراءنا	وراءنا من قومنا
101	حبا منهم	حبا لك منهم
102	فأتنى عليه	فأتنى
The Counsel of 'Utba b. Rabī'a <sup>290</sup>		
103	جاءوا منه	منه جاءوا
104	رأى	ورأى

<sup>286</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:618-19; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1306-8.

<sup>287</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:619.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid.; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1308.

<sup>289</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:620-21; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1309-10.

<sup>290</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:621-23; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1310-12.

105	في أحد	عند أحد
106	نمذكم	أمذكم
107	قال	قال فأرسلوا
108	قد	فقد
109	فما	ما
110	كنا إنما نقاتل	كنا نقاتل
111	حزام على فرس له	حزام
112	منه	منهم
113	يومئذ إلا قتل	إلا قتل يومئذ
114	لم يقتل	لم يقتل نجا على فرس له يقال له الوجيه
115	ثم أسلم	وأسلم
116	في يمينه	يمينه
117	من يوم بدر	يوم بدر
118	ثلاث مئة رجل	ثلاثمائة رجل
119	أو	أم
120	وجدت	رأيت
121	البلايا	الولايا
122	معهم	لهم
123	أرى أن يقتل	أرى يقتل
124	يقتل رجلا	يقتل رجل
125	إنك كبير فريش وسيدها	إنك كبير فريش الليلة وسيدها
126	هل لك إلى أن لاتزال	هل لك أن لاتزال
127	تحمل أمر حليفك	تحمل دم حليفك
Abū Jahl's Rejection of 'Utba's Counsel <sup>291</sup>		
128	فانطلقت حتى جئت أبا جهل	فانطلقت أومّ أبا جهل
129	عتبة أرسلني	عتبة قد أرسلني
130	بين محمد	بين محمد وأصحابه
131	فقال	فقال له
132	حقب الناس	حقب امر الناس
133	عتبة	عتبة بن ربيعة
134	عتبة	عتبة بن ربيعة
135	انتفخ والله سحره	انتفخ سحره
Single Combat <sup>292</sup>		
136	أو لأهدمنه	ولأهدمنه
137	إليه	له
138	أن	زعم أن
139	ثلاثة وهم	المبارزة
140	يقال	إليه
141	هو عبد الله بن رواحه	ثلاثة نفر منهم
142	فقالوا	يقال له
143	قالوا	عبد الله بن رواحه
144	قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث	قالوا
145	وقم يا حمزة	فقالوا
146	وقم يا عليّ	قم يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب، قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث، قم يا عليّ ابن أبي طالب
147	عبيدة	عبيدة بن الحارث
148	واحتملا	فقتلاه واحتملا

<sup>291</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:623-24; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1315-16.

<sup>292</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:624-25; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1316-17.

149	صاحبهما	صاحبهما عبيدة
150	فحازاه	فجاءا
151	إلى أصحابه	به إلى أصحابه
		The Martyrdom of ‘Ubayda b. al-Hārith <sup>293</sup>
152		His [‘Ubayda’s] leg had been cut off and the marrow was oozing from it. When they brought ‘Ubayda to the Prophet, he asked, “Am I not a martyr, O messenger of God?” “Indeed you are,” he replied. Then ‘Ubayda said, “If Abū Ṭālib were alive, then he would know that his words: We keep him safe until we are struck down around him, and we forget our sons and wives, are truly realized in me.”
		Muḥammad’s Straightening of the Ranks and his Prayer in the Booth; the Martyrdom of ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥumām <sup>294</sup>
153	ألا	أن لا
154	اكتنّفكم	اكتنّبكم
155	أبو بكر الصديق	أبو بكر
156	طعن	طعن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
157	سواد	سواد بن غزيرة
158	بالحق والعدل قال فأقذني	بالحق فأقذني قال
159	وقال	ثم قال
160	قال	فقال
161	ما ترى فأردت	ما ترى فلم آمن القتل فأردت
162	أبو بكر الصديق	أبو بكر
163	اللهم إن	اللهم أنك إن
164	اليوم	اليوم يعنى المسلمين
165	لا تعبد	لا تعبد بعد اليوم
166	الله	الله عز وجل
167	فقال أيشر يا أبو بكر	فقال يا أبو بكر
168	من الحوض فأصاب نحره فقتل	من الحوض فقتل
169	حرضهم	حرضهم ونقل كل امرئ منهم ما أصاب
170	أفما	فما
		The Poem of ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥumām <sup>295</sup>
171		I run to God without provision except for fear of God, and working for the Hereafter, and patience in God in the fight, for every other provision is suitable for wastage, except for fear of God, piety and right guidance.
		The Routing of the Meccans <sup>296</sup>

<sup>293</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1318.

<sup>294</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625-28; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1318-21.

<sup>295</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1321.

172	أبو جهل بن هشام	أبو جهل
173	فكان هو المستفتح	فكان هو المستفتح على نفسه
174	بها قريشاً	قريشاً بها
175	أمر	قال
176	فقال شدوا	شدوا
177	الله تعالى	الله
178	من أشرفهم	منهم
179	منوشح	منوشحاً
180	فقال له	فقال
181	والله لكأنك	لكأنك
182	القوم	الناس
183	أوقعها	أوقعها الله
184	بأهل الشرك	بالمشركين
185	القتل الشرك	القتل
186	أحب إليّ	أعجب إليّ
Muhammad's Prohibition of the Killing of Certain Men <sup>297</sup>		
187	ابن أسد	بن أسد
188	رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم	رسول الله
189	أبو حذيفة	أبو حذيفة بن عتبة بن ربيعة
190	إخواننا	أخواننا
191	فقال لعمر	فجعل يقول لعمر
192	يا أبا حفص - قال عمر: والله إنه لأوّل يوم كئناني فيه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأبي حفص - أياضرب وجه عمّ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالسيف؟ فقال عمر: يا رسول الله، دعني فلاضرب عنقه بالسيف، فوالله لقد نأفق.	يا أبا حفص أما تسمع إلى قول إلى حذيفة يقول اضرب وجه عمّ رسول الله بالسيف. فقال عمر يا رسول الله دعني فلاضربنّ عنقه بالسيف فوالله لقد نأفق. فقال عمر: والله إنه لأوّل يوم كئناني فيه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأبي حفص.
193	وكلن	كلن
194	بن زياد	ابن زياد
195	ثم من	من
196	بنى سالم بن عوف	بنى عدى
197	المجذر	المجذر ابن زياد
198	نهاها	نهى
199	فقال له	فقال
200	تتحدّث	تحدّث
201	نساء مكة	نساء قريش من اهل مكة
202	الحياة	الحياة
203	وهو يرتجز	يرتجز
204	زميله	أكيه
The Poem of al-Mujadhdhar <sup>298</sup>		
205	Did you not know or did you forget my lineage? Take note of my lineage, that I am from Balī, those who thrust with Yazanī spears, striking the chief until he is leaned over. Tell the orphan, the one whose father	

<sup>296</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:628; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1322-23.

<sup>297</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:629-30; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1323-25.

<sup>298</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:630.

	is al-Bakhtarī, or tell the same to my son. I am he of whom it is said my origin is Balī. I thrust my spear until it bends. I kill my opponent with a sharp Mashrafī sword. I am ready for death like a camel overfull with milk. You will not see Mujadhdhar telling a lie.	
206	فَاتِيكَ بِهِ	فَاتِيكَ بِهِ فَأَبَى
207	إِلَّا أَنْ يَفَاتِنِي	إِلَّا الْقِتَال
The Death of Umayya b. Khalaf <sup>299</sup>		
208	تَسْمِيَت	سَمِيَت
209	قَالَ فَكَانَ	فَكَانَ
210	إِذْ نَحْنُ	وَنَحْنُ
211	قَالَ: فَقُلْتُ لَهُ: يَا أَبَا عَلِيٍّ، اجْعَلْ مَا شِئْتُ	فَقُلْتُ اجْعَلْ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنَكَ يَا أَبَا عَلِيٍّ، مَا شِئْتُ
212	قَالَ فَقُلْتُ	فَقُلْتُ
213	أَخَذَ	أَخَذَا
214	قَالَ لِي	قَالَ
215	هَذَا اللَّهُ ذَا	هَلَمْ إِذَا
216	ثُمَّ	قَالَ ثُمَّ
217	عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَنِ	عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَانِ
218	بِلَالٍ بِمَكَّةَ عَلَى تَرْكِ	بِلَالٍ بِمَكَّةَ عَلَى أَنْ يَتْرَكَ
219	أَوْ	حَتَّى
220	قَالَ	فَقَالَ
221	فَلَمَّا رَأَاهُ قَالَ	بِلَالٌ حِينَ رَأَاهُ
222	نَجَا	نَجَوْتُ
223	نَجَا	نَجَوَا
224	أَتَسْمَعُ	تَسْمَعُ
225	نَجَا	نَجَوَا
226	قَالَ ثُمَّ	ثُمَّ
227	حَتَّى	ثُمَّ
228	قَالَ فَأَخْلَفَ رَجُلَ السَّيْفِ فَضْرَبَ	قَالَ فَضْرَبَ
229	وَصَاحَ	قَالَ وَصَاحَ
230	بِمِثْلِهَا	مِثْلَهَا
231	لَا نَجَاءَ بِكَ	لَا نَجَاءَ
232	عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَنِ	عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَانِ
233	يَرْحَمُ اللَّهُ	رَحِمَ اللَّهُ
The Fighting by Angels at Badr <sup>300</sup>		
	Abū Usayd's Knowledge of the Location from where the Angels Emerged <sup>301</sup>	
234	'Abd Allāh b. Abū Bakr from one of Banū Sā'ida from Abū Usayd Mālik b. Rabī'a who was present at Badr said,	

<sup>299</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:631-32; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1325-27.

<sup>300</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:633-34; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1328-29.

<sup>301</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:633.

	after he had lost his sight, “If I were at Badr today and had my sight, then I would show you the canyon from where the angels came forth. I have no question about it; I have no doubt.”	
235	عرفت أنه	عرفت أن
236	سيما	سيما
237	أرسلوها على ظهورهم	أرسلوها في ظهورهم
238	يوم سوى بدر من الأيام	يوم من الأيام سوى بدر
	The Death of Abū Jahl <sup>302</sup>	
	The Poem of Abū Jahl <sup>303</sup>	
239	Abū Jahl advanced reciting, and he was fighting and saying: What does an endless war detest about me, a young he-camel with gleaming teeth? For such as this my mother bore me.	
240	أمر بابي جهل أن يلتمس في القتلى	أمر بابي جهل أن يلتمس في القتلى. وقال اللهم لا يعجزتك
241	ابن عمرو	بن عمرو
242	الجموح، أخو بني سلمة	الجموح
243	قال فلما	فلما
244	وضعت	جعلت
245	قدمي	رجلي
246	عاش	عاش معاذ
247	كان زمان عثمان	كان في زمن عثمان
248	جرح في ركبته	جرح بركبته
249	يوما أنا وهو	أنا وهو يوما
250	لم يزل أثره به	لم أثره فيه بعد
251	قلت له	قلت
252	الدائرة اليوم	الدبرة
253	قال لي	قال لي أبو جهل
254	مرتقى صعبا يا رويعي الغنم	يا رويعي الغنم مرتقى صعبا
255	قال وكانت	وكانت
	Muḥammad’s Miraculous Turning of a Stick into a Sword for ‘Ukkāsha <sup>304</sup>	
256	‘Ukkāsha b. Miḥṣan b. Ḥurthān al-Asadī, an ally of Banū ‘Abd Shams b. ‘Abd Manāf, fought at Badr with his sword until it broke in his hand. He came to the Prophet who gave him a wooden stick and said, “Fight with this O ‘Ukkāsha.” When he took it from the Prophet, he brandished it and it became in his hand a long, strong, gleaming sword, and he fought with it	

<sup>302</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 634-36; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1329-31.

<sup>303</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:634.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 637.

	<p>until God Most High gave victory to the Muslims. That sword was called al-ʿAwn and he did not cease from having it, fighting with it in battles with the Prophet until he was killed in the rebellion, where he still had it. Ṭulayḥa b. Khuwaylid al-Asadī killed him.</p>	
	<p>The Poem of Ṭulayḥa b. Khuwaylid al-Asadī Concerning his Slaying of ʿUkkāsha<sup>305</sup></p>	
257	<p>What do you think about the people when you kill them? Are they not men even though they are not Muslims? If camels and women were captured, you will not leave untouched at the killing of Ḥibāl. I raised against them the breast of Ḥimāla, a mare accustomed to the saying: “Warriors, attack!” (One day you will see her in splendor and protection. Another day you will see her without glory.) the night I left Ibn Aqram alive and ʿUkkāsha the Ghanmite on the field.</p>	
	<p>Muḥammad’s Prayer for ʿUkkāsha; ʿUkkāsha as the Best Muslim Horseman<sup>306</sup></p>	
258	<p>When the Prophet said, “70,000 of my people will enter Paradise like the full moon on the night of Badr,” ʿUkkāsha asked the Prophet, “O messenger of God, pray to God to make me one of them.” He replied, “Verily you are among them,” or “O God, make him one of them.” Then a man of the Anṣār arose and said, “O messenger of God, pray to God to make me one of them.” He replied, “ʿUkkāsha has forestalled you and the prayer is cold.” I heard from his family that the Prophet said, “Ours is the best horseman among the Arabs.” They asked, “Who, O messenger of God?” He said, “ʿUkkāsha b. Miḥṣan.” When Dirār b. al-Azwar al-Asadī said, “That</p>	

<sup>305</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:637.

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, 638.

	is a man of ours O messenger of God.” The Prophet answered, “He is not yours but ours through alliance.”	
Muḥammad and the Meccan Dead in the Pit <sup>307</sup>		
259	في درعه فملاها	في درعه حتى ملأها
260	فتزأيل لحمه	فتزأيل
261	وقف عليهم	وقف
262	قالت فقال	فقال
263	فقال لهم	قال
264	ما وعدهم ربهم حقا	ما وعدهم حق
265	قال لهم	قال
266	من جوف الليل وهو يقول	وهو يقول من جوف الليل
267	كان منهم في القليب	كان معهم في القليب
268	ما وعد ربكم	ما وعدكم ربكم
269	قال يوم	يوم قال
The Poem of Ḥassān b. Thābit <sup>308</sup>		
270	<p>I recognize the dwellings of Zaynab on the sandhill. It's like the writing of revelation on new paper. The winds circulate them and every distinct cloud pours down rain. Its traces are gone and passed away, deserted once being the abodes of friends. Leave the daily remembrance. Return to the passion of the dejected heart. Declare that in which there is no shame, the truth and not the stories of the liar, of what God did at the battle of Badr. We were over the polytheists in fortune. The battle was like their company at Ḥirā', whose establishment began at the darkness of sunset. We met them, ours was an assembly, like lions of the jungle young and old, in front of Muḥammad, defending him against the enemy in the heat of war. In their hands were sharp, slender swords and tried-and-true shafts with thick knots. The sons of al-Aws and al-Ghaṭārif assisted them, the sons of al-Najjār in the strong religion. We left Abū Jahl on the ground, And we left 'Utba on the ground.</p>	

<sup>307</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:638-41; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1331-33.

<sup>308</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:639-40.

	<p>We left Shayba among men of fading opinion even if they were referred to as esteemed.</p> <p>The messenger of God called to them when we dispatched all of them into the well.</p> <p>“Have you found my words to be true? And the command of God takes hold of the heart?”</p> <p>They spoke not. If they had spoken, they would have said, “You were correct and your judgment was right.”</p>	
271	أمر	أمر بهم
272	تغير لونه	تغير
273	يا رسول الله	يا نبي الله
274	أحزنتني	حزنتني
275	ذلك	ذلك قال
276	فدعا له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم	فدعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم له
	The Revelation of the Qur’ān Concerning Some Meccans Killed at Badr <sup>309</sup>	
277	<p>The Qur’ān came down concerning men who were killed at Badr, according to what was told to me: Those whom the angels took who were wronging themselves they asked, “Why was it you?” They said, “We were oppressed in the earth.” They said, “Was not God’s earth wide enough for you to have migrated within it? Of those, their dwelling is hell, a displeasing fate.” The men were: from Banū Asad b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā b. Quṣayy: al-Ḥārith b. Zama‘a b. al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib; from Banū Makhzūm: Abū Qays b. al-Fākih b. al-Mughīra b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Makhzūm; from Banū Jumaḥ: ‘Alī b. Umayya b. Khalaf b. Wahb b. Ḥudhāfa b. Jumaḥ; and from Banū Sahn: al-‘Āṣ b. Munabbih b. al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘Āmir b. Ḥudhayfa b. Sa’d b. Sahn. They used to be Muslims when the Prophet was in Mecca. When the Prophet migrated to Medina, their fathers and families in Mecca seduced them, and they fell to temptation. Then they marched with their people to Badr and were all</p>	

<sup>309</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:641.

	killed.	
		The Division of the Booty <sup>310</sup>
278	هو لنا	هو لنا قد كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نقل كل امرئ ما أصاب
279	والله لولا	لولا
280	عنكم القوم	القوم عنكم
281	والله لقد	لقد
282	منحنا الله تعالى	ولانا الله ومنحنا
283	فينا اصحاب	فينا معشر اصحاب
284	على السواء	على السواء. فكان في ذلك تقوى الله وطاعة رسوله وصلاح ذات البين.
		The Sword al-Marzubān as Booty <sup>311</sup>
285		Ibn Ishāq said: ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr told me that Mālik b. Rabī‘a one of Banū Sā‘ida from Abū Usayd al-Sā‘idī said: “I got a sword belonging to Banū ‘Ā‘idh the Makhzūmite which was called al-Marzubān on the day of Badr. When the Prophet ordered the people to turn in what booty they had taken, I came and threw it in with the spoils.” The Prophet did not hold back anything he was asked for, and al-Arqam b. Abī al-Arqam knew this. He asked the Prophet for it, and he gave it to him.
		News of the Muslims’ Victory in Medina and Mecca <sup>312</sup>
286	الله عز وجل	الله
287	سويينا التراب رقية	سويينا على رقية
288	ابنة	بنت
289	أن زيد بن حارثة قدم	قال ثم قدم زيد بن حارثة
290	ابن هشام	بن هشام
291	أبو البخترى العاص بن هشام	أبو البخترى بن هشام
292	نبيه ومنبه	منبه ونبيه
293	يا أبت	يا أبه
294	واحتمل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم	فاحتمل
295	عبد الله بن كعب بن عمرو بن عوف بن مبدول بن عمرو بن مازن بن النجار	عبد الله بن كعب بن زيد بن عوف بن مبدول بن عمرو بن مازن بن النجار
		A Poem by a Rajaz Poet of the Muslims <sup>313</sup>
296		Release the camels, O Basbas. There is no festival in Dhū Ṭalḥ, and no enclosure in the desert of Ghumayr. The people’s camels cannot be shut in. Sending them on the road is smarter.

<sup>310</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:641-42; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1333-34.

<sup>311</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:642.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, 642-46; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1334-38.

<sup>313</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:643.

	God has given victory and Akhnas has run away.	
297	على السوء	على السوء. واستقى له من ماء به يقال له الارواق.
298	سلمة بن سلامة	سلمة بن سلامة بن وقش
299	أى ابن أخى	يا ابن أخى
		The Number of Meccan Prisoners and their Dead <sup>314</sup>
300		The polytheist prisoners were with the Prophet. There were forty-four prisoners. Among the dead was a similar number as that of the prisoners.
301	النضر بن الحارث	النضر بن الحارث بن كعدة
302	بقتله	ان يقتل
303	الأنصارى	الأنصارى ثم
304	أخو بنى عمرو	أحد بنى عمرو
305	وهو كان حجام	وكان حجام
306	إنما هو أبو هند	إنما أبو هند
307	فلا والله	فوالله
308	أى أبا يزيد	يا أبا يزيد
309	أعلى الله رسوله	أعلى الله وعلى رسوله
310	رسوله تحرضين	رسوله
311	لعلها تقديه	لعلها ان تقديه
312	خبز	من الخبز
313	مكة	مكة بمصاب
314	عبد الله الخزاعى	عبد الله بن اياس بن ضبيعة ابن مازن بن كعب بن عمرو الخزاعى
315	ونبيه ومنبه ابنا الحجاج وأبو البختري بن هشام	وأبو البختري بن هشام ونبيه ومنبه ابنا الحجاج
316	فاسئلوه	فسئلوه
317	ها هو	هو
		The Death of Abū Lahab <sup>315</sup>
318	فأسلم العباس، وأسلمت أم الفضل	وأسلمت أم الفضل
319	يكره خلافهم	يكره ان يخالفهم
320	أبو لهب	أبو لهب عدو الله
321	كانوا صنعوا	صنعوا
322	جاءه	جاء
323	الأقذاح	القذاح
324	أقذاحى	القذاح
325	أقبل أبو لهب	أقبل الفاسق أبو لهب
326	فبينما	فبينما
327	ابن الحارث	بن الحارث
328	قال له	قال
329	جلس	جلس إليه
330	يا بن أخى	يا ابن أخى
331	قال والله	قال لا شىء والله

<sup>314</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1335; Watt notes, "Ibn Ishāq has lists which give the numbers as 50 dead and 43 prisoners . . . but Ibn Hishām adds further names which bring the totals to 70 dead and 70 prisoners" Watt and McDonald, *Muḥammad at Mecca*, 65.

<sup>315</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:646-47; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1339-40.

332	والله ما هو إلا أن	والله أن كان إلا أن
333	لقتينا القوم	لقتيناهم
334	يقودننا	يقتلوننا
335	أكتافنا يقودننا كيف شاءوا	أكتافنا يقتلوننا
336	ويأسروننا	ويأسرون
337	والله ما	ما
338	تلك والله الملائكة	تلك الملائكة
339	ضرب بها	ضرب
340	فلقت	فلقت
341	الله	الله عز وجل
		The Burial of Abū Lahab <sup>316</sup>
342		His [Abū Lahab] two sons left him for two or three nights without burying him until he began to reek in his house—Quraysh were afraid of pustules and their infectiousness as people are afraid of the plague—until a man of Quraysh said to them, “Woe unto you. Are you not ashamed that your father is reeking in his house for not burying him?” They replied, “We are afraid of this ulcer.” He said, “Go, and I will go with you.” They did not wash him except to throw water on him from afar without touching him. Then they carried him and buried him in the highest part of Mecca next to a wall. And they cast stones over him until they covered him.
		Al-‘Abbās in Prison <sup>317</sup>
343		According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama b. Faḍl—Muḥammad b. Ishāq—al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ma‘bad—a member of his family—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās: In the evening after the day of Badr, when the prisoners were fastened with chains, the Prophet was unable to sleep in the first part of the night. His companions asked him, “O messenger of God, why are you not sleeping?” He replied, “I heard al-‘Abbās writhing in his chains.” So they left to al-‘Abbās and released his chains, and the Prophet went to sleep.
		The Capture of al-‘Abbās <sup>318</sup>
344		According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama b. Faḍl—Muḥammad b. Ishāq—al-Ḥasan

<sup>316</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1340-41.

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, 1341.

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*.

		b. ‘Umāra—al-Ḥakam b. ‘Utayba—Miqsam—Ibn ‘Abbās: The one who captured al-‘Abbās was Abū al-Yasar Ka‘b b. ‘Amr, the brother of Banū Salima. Abū al-Yasar was a small man, and al-‘Abbās was a bulky man. The Prophet asked Abū al-Yasar, “How did you capture al-‘Abbās, O Abū al-Yasar?” He replied, “O messenger of God, a man who I have not seen before or afterwards helped me against him. His appearance was such-and-such.” The Prophet said, “A noble angle helped you against him.”
	The Ransom of the Meccan Prisoners <sup>319</sup>	
345	يبليغ	يبليغ ذلك
346	يشمتوا	يشمت
347	في أسراكم	في فداء أسراكم
348	الأسود بن المطلب	الأسود بن عبد يغوث
349	ثلاثة	ثلاثة
350	الحارث بن زمعة	الحارث بن الأسود
351	فذاك	فذلك
352	يقول الأسود	يقول
353	كيسا تاجرا	تاجرا كيسا
354	في طلب فداء	في فداء
355	يارب	يأرب
356	لا تعجلوا وانسل	لا تعجلوا بفداء أسرائكم ثم انسل
	The Poem of Mālik b. al-Dukhshum <sup>320</sup>	
357	I captured Suhayl and I did not hand him over for a prisoner from all other people. Khindif knows that its hero is Suhayl when he is mistreated. I struck with my blade until it bent. I was unwilling to fight against this hare-lipped man.	
358	دعنى أزرع	انتزع
359	سهيل بن عمرو	سهيل بن عمرو السفليين
360	قال	فقال
	The Poem of Mikraz <sup>321</sup>	
361	I ransomed with costly she-camels a captured hero, the payment being awarded for a genuine loss not for clients. I pledged myself, even though money is easier for me, but I feared being shamed.	

<sup>319</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:648-53; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1342-48.

<sup>320</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:649.

<sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, 650.

	I said, "Suhayl is the best of us. Take him to our sons so that we receive our demands."	
		The Ransom of al-‘Abbās <sup>322</sup>
362		According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama—Muḥammad b. Ishāq—al-Kalbī—Abū Ṣāliḥ—Ibn ‘Abbās: The Prophet said to al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib when he was brought to Medina, "O al-‘Abbās, ransom yourself, your two nephews, ‘Aqīl b. Abī Ṭālib and Nawfal b. al-Ḥārith, and your ally, ‘Utba b. ‘Amr b. Jaḥdam, the brother of Banū al-Ḥārith b. Fihri, for you are wealthy." He replied, "O messenger of God, I was a Muslim, but the people compelled me against my will." He said, "God knows best about your Islam. If what you say is true, then God will reward you for it. As for your external acts, they were against us, so redeem yourself." The Prophet had taken twenty ounces ( <i>ūqiyya</i> ) of gold from him, and al-‘Abbās said, "O messenger of God, credit this towards my ransom." He replied, "No, that was something which God Mighty and Majestic gave to us from you." He said, "I have no money." He said, "Where is the money that you left in Mecca with Umm al-Faḍl d. al-Ḥārith when you set out? No one was with the two of you, and you said to her, 'If I am killed in my journey, so much is for al-Faḍl, so much is for ‘Abd Allāh, so much is for Qutham, and so much is for ‘Ubayd Allāh?'" He said, "By Him who sent you with the truth, nobody knows this except for me and her, and I know that you are the messenger of God." So al-‘Abbās ransomed himself, his two nephews, and his ally.
363	ابنة	ابنة
364	أسرى	أسارى
365	فبينما	فبينما
366	محبوس بالمدينة	محبوس
367	إذ خرج	خرج
368	شيخا مسلما	شيخا كبيرا مسلما

<sup>322</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1344-45.

369	كان عهد	عهد
370	لا يعرضون	لا تعترض
371	جاء حاجاً	حاجاً
372	فحبسه بمكة	بمكة فحبسه
373	عمرو	عمرو ابن ابي سفيان
	Hassān b. Thābit's Answer to Abū Sufyān <sup>323</sup>	
374	If Sa'd were free in the day he was in Mecca, then many among you would be killed—however he was captured—with a sharp sword or with a bow made of nab'a wood, twanging as it vibrates when the arrow is shot.	
375	يفكوا به	يفكوا
376	صاحبهم	شيخهم
377	وكانت خديجة	خديجة
378	ينزل عليه الوحي	ينزل عليه
379	الله	الله عز وجل
380	احدى ابنتيه رقية	رقية
381	الله تعالى	الله عز وجل
382	بالعداوة	باعدوه
383	أبي العاص	أبي العاص بن الربيع
384	من قريش شئت	شئت من قريش
385	لا والله	لا ها الله
386	إني	إذا
387	ثم	قال ثم
388	إلى عتبة	إلى الفاسق بن الفاسق عتبة
389	بنت	ابنة
390	نتكحك	نزوجك
391	بنت	ابنة
392	بنت	ابنة
393	بنت	ابنة
394	لم يكن دخل	لم يكن عدو الله
395	لا يقدر أن	لا يقدر على أن
396	عليه ما لها	عليه الذي لها
	Zaynab's Departure to Medina <sup>324</sup>	
397	وعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ذلك	وعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
398	يا	أى
399	بنت	ابنه
400	تبلغين	تبلغين
401	تضطني	تضطني
402	ما بين	ما يدخل بين
403	بنت	ابنة
404	رجال من قريش	رجال قريش
405	والفهري	ونافع ابن عبد القيس الفهري
406	رجعت	رجعت

<sup>323</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:651.

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, 653-57; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1348-50.

407	برك حموها كنانة	برك حموها
408	أتى	أتاه
409	في جلة من قريش	في جلة قريش
410	الناس	الرجال
411	بابنته إلتى	بابنته
412	علانية على رعوس الناس من	علانية من
413	عن مصبيتنا	عن مصبيتنا ونكبتنا
414	عن أبيها من حاجة	عن أبيها
415	هدات الأصوات	هدا الصوت
416	قال ففعل	ففعل
417	فأقامت لبالي حتى	حتى
418	هدات الأصوات	هدا الصوت
	The Poem of the Affair of Zaynab <sup>325</sup>	
419	<p>‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa or Abū Khaythama, brother of Banū Sālim b. ‘Awf, said of the affair of Zaynab:  News came to me that the people were without consideration for Zaynab, involving unruliness and crimes. In her departure, Muḥammad was not put to shame on account of the severe war between us.  Abū Sufyān was affected from his alliance with Ḍamḍam. From our war he was spited and remorseful. We bound his son ‘Amr and his sworn client with clanging iron shackles. I swear not to detach the squadron from us, a leader of the army with many the officer.  Driving unbelieving Quraysh until we overcome them, with a muzzle over their noses, with a branding iron. We fight them to the edges of Najd and Nakhla.  If they drop to the lower earth, we are with horse and men.  Never will our squadron turn aside. We will overcome them with the fates of ‘Ād and Jurhum.  A people regret if they disobeyed Muḥammad in their affair, for any time it is to repent.  Report to Abū Sufyān if you meet him: “If you are not pure in worship and embrace Islam, then shame in life will quickly be yours.  And you’ll be in a state of tar forever in hell.”</p>	

<sup>325</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:655-56.

	Abū Sufyān's sworn client was 'Āmir b. al-Ḥaḍramī who was among the prisoners. An ally of al-Ḥaḍramī was Ḥarb b. Umayya.	
	The Poem of Hind d. 'Utba <sup>326</sup>	
420	When those who had gone to Zaynab returned, Hind d. 'Utba met them and said to them: In peace you are wild asses, distasteful and crude, and in war resembling menstruating women.	
	The Poem of Kināna b. al-Rabī <sup>327</sup>	
421	Kināna b. al-Rabī said of the affair of Zaynab, when he handed her over to the two men: I am amazed at Habbār and the riffraff of his people, who want the breach of my word concerning the daughter of Muḥammad. I do not care as long as I live for their numbers, and as long as my hand collects a grasp of the sword.	
	Muḥammad's Order to Burn Two Men with Fire <sup>328</sup>	
422	Yazīd b. Abū Ḥaīb—Bukayr b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ashajj—Sulaymān b. Yasār—Abū Ishāq al-Dawsī—Abū Hurayra: The Prophet dispatched a raiding party, and I was among it, and he said to us, "If you seize Habbār b. al-Aswad or the man who first got to Zaynab with him, then burn both of them with fire." When the next day came, he sent word to us: "I had ordered you with the burning of these two men if you got hold of them; then I considered that no one has the right to punish by fire except for God, so if you capture them, kill them."	
	The Conversion of Abū al-'Āṣ b. al-Rabī <sup>329</sup>	
422	خرج أبو العاص	خرج
423	لرجال	رجال
424	أجارته وجاء في طلب	أجارته في طلب
425	قال فلما	فلما
426	ما علمت بشيء من ذلك حتى سمعت	ما علمت بشيء كان حتى سمعت

<sup>326</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:656.

<sup>327</sup> *Ibid.*, 656-57.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, 657.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*, 657-59; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1350-51.

427	أفاء	أفاءه
428	فقالوا	قالوا
429	عليه	عليه قال
430	فردوه	فردوا
431	حتى	ماله حتى
432	بالدلو	بالحبل
433	فأنا	فأنى
434	على التكااح	بالتكااح
435	شيئاً	شيئاً بعد ست سنين
	The Freedom without Payment of Some Meccan Prisoners <sup>330</sup>	
436	Among the prisoners who, I was told, were freed without paying ransom were: from Banū ‘Abd Shams b. ‘Abd Manāf: Abū al-‘Āṣ b. al-Rabī b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā b. ‘Abd Shams, who the Prophet freed after Zaynab, the daughter of the Prophet, had sent his ransom; from Banū Makhzūm: al-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥanṭab b. al-Ḥārith b. ‘Ubayda b. ‘Umar b. Makhzūm, who belonged to some of Banū al-Ḥārith b. al-Khazraj. He was left in their hands until they let him on his way, and he united with his people; and Ṣayfī b. Abū Rifā‘a b. ‘Ābid b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Makhzūm. He was left in the hands of his captors, and when no one came for his ransom, they stipulated that he send them his ransom and then let him on his way, but he did not pay them anything.	
	Ḥassān b. Thābit’s Poem Concerning Ṣayfī b. Abī Rifā‘a <sup>331</sup>	
437	Ṣayfī is not the one to pay his pledge, the back of a fox weary at some waterplace.	
	(Continuation of) The Freedom without Payment of Some Meccan Prisoners <sup>332</sup>	
438	... and Abū ‘Azza ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthmān b. Uhayb b. Ḥudhāfa b. Jumah. He was a poor man with daughters. He spoke to the Prophet, and he said, “O messenger of God, you know that I have no money and that I am in great need and of a large family, so free me.” The Prophet freed him, stipulating that he not fight against	

<sup>330</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:659-60.

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, 660.

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*

	him again.	
	The Poem of Abū 'Azza <sup>333</sup>	
439	Abū 'Azza said, praising the Prophet and mentioning his kindness among his people: Who will get hold of the messenger Muḥammad, from me: you are true and the King is to be praised. You are a man who invites to the truth and right guidance. Upon you is a witness from the exalted God. You are a man who obtains an abode among us, to which there are steps easy and ascending. Those who wage war against you are damned; those who make peace with you are happy. But when I remember Badr and its people, I am revisited with sorrow and am desisted. <sup>334</sup>	
	The Conversion of 'Umayr b. Wahb <sup>335</sup>	
440	في الحجر بيسير	بيسير في الحجر
441	وممن كان	وكان ممن
442	هو	هم
443	بعدهم خير	خير بعدهم
444	قال	فقال
445	قال فاغتنمها	فاغتنمها
446	صفوان	صفوان بن أمية
447	أواسيهم	اسوتهم
448	فقال له	قال
449	اكنتم	اكنتم علي
450	ثم أمر	ثم
451	أمر عمير	عميرا أمر
452	من المسلمين	من المسلمين في المسجد
453	الله	الله عز وجل
454	أناخ على باب	أناخ بعيره على باب
455	والله ما جاء	ما جاء
456	كانوا	كان
457	احذروا عليه من	احذروا
458	هذا الخبيث	هذا الخبيث عليه
459	سيفه في عنقه	سيفه
460	فقال	قال
461	بها لحديث عهد	لحديث عهد بها

<sup>333</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:660.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, 659-60; Guillaume notes, "This is perhaps the most blatant forgery of all the 'poems' of the *Sīra*. The heathen author's record was so bad that the prophet ordered his execution and yet he is made to utter fulsome praise of him and devotion to Islam." Guillaume, *Life of Muḥammad*, 318.

<sup>335</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:661-64; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1352-54.

462	فما	ما
463	هل اغنت عنا شيئاً	هل اغنت شيئاً
464	ما الذي	بالذي
465	عيال عندي	عيال
466	الله	الله عز وجل
467	بين	بيني
468	بينك وبين	بيني وبينك
469	ذلك قال	فقال
470	شهد	تشهد
471	أقرنوه القرآن	أقرنوه و علموه القرآن
472	ففعّلوا	قال ففعّلوا
473	أنا	أني
474	الله	الله تآلى
475	وإلى رسول صلى الله عليه وسلم، وإلى الإسلام	وإلى الإسلام
476	لعل الله يهديهم	لعل الله ان يهديهم
477	صفوان بن أمية	صفوان
478	ابن	بن
479	يقول	يقول لقريش
480	أخبره عن إسلامه	أخبره بإسلامه
481	حلف أن لا يكلمه	حلف إلا يكلمه
	God's Words Concerning the Devil in the Form of Surāqa b. Mālik <sup>336</sup>	
482	<p>ʿUmayr b. Wahb or al-Ḥārith b. Hishām told me that he saw the devil when he turned on his heels on the day of Badr and said, “Where are you going, O Surāqa?” The enemy of God lay on the ground and disappeared. And God Most High sent down concerning him: “When Satan made their works seem pleasing to them and said, ‘No one can overcome you today from among the people, for I am your protector.’” And he mentioned that the devil enticed them and took the form of Surāqa b. Mālik Ju’shum when they remembered what was between them and Banū Bakr b. ‘Abd Manāf b. Kināna as regards the war that was between them. God Most High says, “And when the two forces came in sight of each other,” and the enemy of God saw the armies of God which were made of the angels. God strengthened His prophet and the believers against their enemies. “He turned on his heels and said, ‘Indeed I am clear of you. Indeed I see what you do not see.’” The enemy of God spoke the truth, for he saw</p>	

<sup>336</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:663.

	<p>what they did not see and said,  “Indeed I fear God, and God is severe  in punishment.” I was told that they  used to see him in every camp in the  form of Surāqa not knowing it to be  him until on the day of Badr when the  two armies met, he turned on his  heels. He brought them along and  then deserted them.</p>	
	<p>Another Poem of Hassān b. Thābit<sup>337</sup></p>	
483	<p>My people, they it was who sheltered  their prophet,  and believed in him when the  inhabitants of the earth were  unbelievers,  except a special people; they were  forefathers, to the pious; with the  Helpers, helpers, rejoicing in the  promise of God;  their saying when he came to them,  noble of origin, chosen:  Welcome, in security and in comfort,  the blessing of the prophet and the  blessing of the promise.  And the guest; they bestowed upon  him a home in which is no fear, a  home of homes.  They distributed their wealth when  the emigrants came, while the portion  of the unbeliever is hell.  We marched to Badr; they marched to  their death.  If they knew the sure knowledge, they  would not have marched.  He (Satan) led them with deception;  then he deserted them, for evil is for  his friend, deceived.  He said, “I am for you as a protector,”  and brought them to an evil  destination, within which was shame  and disgrace.  Then we met, and they fled from their  leaders,  to the highlands, and some of them to  the lowlands.</p>	
		<p>The Excusal of Sa’d b. Mu’ādh from a  Purported Punishment<sup>338</sup></p>
484		<p>According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama—  Muḥammad b. Ishāq: When this verse</p>

<sup>337</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:664.

<sup>338</sup> *Al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh*, 3:1357.

		came down: "It is not for a prophet to have captives," the Prophet said, "If punishment were to come down from heaven, no one would escape from it except Sa'd b. Mu'adh, for his saying, 'O prophet of God, abundance in killing is dearer to me than the sparing of men.'"
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## CHAPTER 2

**AL-WĀQIDĪ AND DEPENDENCE**

The analysis of the material of al-Wāqidī for the three Badr stories is performed in comparison with the material of Ibn Ishāq. Each of the stories is divided into sections in which the texts and a table of the variants are displayed, followed by a discussion of the findings.

An indication that al-Wāqidī depended upon the work of his predecessor is the event that the storyline in his version parallels the corresponding storyline in Ibn Ishāq's version. The parallels are not required to be literal, but their content or information conveyed must be essentially the same. The methodological benefit of detecting non-literal parallels is the allowance for variants, intentional or unintentional, to have entered the text. As long as the variants are not major in that they do not render divergences in meaning or content to the passage, the probability of al-Wāqidī's dependence upon Ibn Ishāq is maintained (Examples of such minor variants are synonyms and variations in word order). A stronger indicator that Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq is the event that the two versions share literal parallels, i.e., phrases/sentences in one version that are identical to phrases/sentences in the other. When attempting to detect the occurrence of dependence, literal parallels rank as the clearest proof. In the event that the variants are major and transformative of the storyline, the probability of dependence is rejected. The strength of the conclusion drawn by the proposed method is proportional to the amount of parallels detected.

For the Ibn Ishāq-material, the recension of Ibn Hishām is utilized, since the previous chapter discovered the Ibn Ishāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī to have undergone some alterations.<sup>339</sup> Nevertheless, the two recensions are nearly identical, and the variants of the Ibn Ishāq-material from the recension of al-Ṭabarī are footnoted

---

<sup>339</sup> For a summary, see pages 66-67 of the present study.

in the displayed texts. Also the variants are made clear in the table of variants in the event that they parallel the text of al-Wāqidī.

### The Council of War

Al-Wāqidī's version of the council of war is divisible into seven sections.

Possessing five of the seven sections, the version by Ibn Ishāq corresponds substantially in content with al-Wāqidī's version. By comparison, most other sources contain one, two, or sometimes three of the sections.<sup>340</sup> Moreover, the storyline and chronology in Ibn Ishāq match those in al-Wāqidī, whereas other sources put forward different storylines and chronologies. For example, while one source agrees with al-Wāqidī in having al-Miqdād give counsel to the Prophet,<sup>341</sup> another source excludes al-Miqdād from the council.<sup>342</sup> Also, the sequence of the council in one source is in line with al-Wāqidī by having al-Miqdād give counsel prior to Sa'd b. Mu'ād,<sup>343</sup> yet the order is reversed elsewhere.<sup>344</sup> A divergence of major significance has Muḥammad convene the counsel under a different circumstance than that in al-Wāqidī.<sup>345</sup> Therefore due to close correspondences in content, storyline and chronology, Ibn Ishāq's version comes nearest in similarity to al-Wāqidī's version.<sup>346</sup> Given these resemblances, one already begins to suspect that al-Wāqidī drew his council story from his predecessor.

<sup>340</sup> Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 3:263-64; Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, ed. Muḥammad Hamīd Allāh (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1959), 293, no. 659; Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, *Al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Ludolf Krehl and Th. W. Juynboll (Leiden: Brill, 1862-1908), 3:54; Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt* 2:8, 16; 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 5:350, no. 9727.

<sup>341</sup> Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *Al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*, ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī (Baghdad: Jumhūrīya al-'Irāqīya, 1980-85), 4, no. 4056, quoted in Uri Rubin, "The Life of Muḥammad and the Islamic Self Image: A Comparative Analysis of an Episode in the Campaigns of Badr and Al-Ḥudaybiya," in Motzki, *Biography*, 11. See also Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 3:263-64.

<sup>342</sup> 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 5:350, no. 9727.

<sup>343</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625; al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48.

<sup>344</sup> In the *Tafsīr* of al-Ṭabarī under Q. 8:5. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi' al-bayān 'an ta'wīl āy al-Qur'ān*, ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākīr and Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākīr (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1955-1969), 13:390.

<sup>345</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:106-7.

<sup>346</sup> Given the vast array of sources in Islamic historiography, the possibility of the existence of another source more similar than Ibn Ishāq cannot be ruled out.

Nevertheless a textual comparison which makes sense of the manifold variants and uniformities between the versions is necessary for a substantive determination.

The Council of War— Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>347</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>348</sup>
News came to him [Muḥammad] about Quraysh's advance to protect their caravan. He consulted the people and told them about Quraysh. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq arose and spoke well. Then 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.	They said: The Prophet proceeded, and when he was near Badr, news about the advance of Quraysh came to him. The Prophet told the people about their advance and consulted them. Abū Bakr arose and spoke well. Then 'Umar arose and spoke well.
وأتاه الخبر عن قريش بمسيرهم ليمنعوا عبرهم، فاستشار الناس، <sup>349</sup> وأخبرهم عن قريش، فقام أبو بكر الصديق، <sup>350</sup> فقال وأحسن. <sup>351</sup> ثم قام عمر بن الخطاب، فقال وأحسن. <sup>352</sup>	قالوا: ومضى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى إذا كان بدر أتاه الخبر بمسير قريش، فأخبرهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بمسيرهم، واستشار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس، فقام أبو بكر فقال فأحسن، ثم قام عمر فقال فأحسن.

	Ibn Ishāq	Al-Wāqidī
1	Not present	ومضى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى إذا كان دوين بدر
2	أتاه الخبر عن قريش بمسير	أتاه الخبر بمسير قريش
3	فاستشار الناس، وأخبرهم عن قريش	فأخبرهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بمسيرهم، واستشار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس
4	فقام أبو بكر الصديق	أبو بكر
5	عمر بن الخطاب	عمر

The variants between the two versions are minor. Other than a difference in sentence order (3), the variants amount to the presence of supplementary words in one version or the other. In one instance, the version of al-Wāqidī includes an additional title and its associated honorific of Muḥammad (3), and the version of Ibn Ishāq includes an extra preposition (2), the appellation for Abū Bakr (4), and the family name of 'Umar (5). The only significant difference between the texts is a sentence found solely in the version of al-Wāqidī (1). Since this sentence was most probably inserted by al-

<sup>347</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614-15.

<sup>348</sup> Al-Wāqidī characteristically begins his combined report with *qālū*. Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48.

<sup>349</sup> فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 3:1300.

<sup>350</sup> أبو بكر رضي الله عنه. Ibid.

<sup>351</sup> فقال فأحسن. Ibid.

<sup>352</sup> فقال فأحسن. Ibid.

Wāqidī for the purpose of introducing his combined report, the implication of the difference is negligible.

The minor variants that characterize this passage are inconsequential when attempting the detection of dependence of one text upon the other. Consequently, the versions are parallel to one another. Altogether there are five parallels. They are:

1. News about the advance of Quraysh came to Muḥammad.
2. Muḥammad informed the people of Quraysh's advance.
3. Muḥammad consulted the people.
4. Abū Bakr arose and spoke well.
5. 'Umar arose and spoke well.

The versions are, minor variants aside, virtually identical, reflecting a reasonable probability that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq for his version of the story.

#### The Council of War—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī <sup>353</sup>
Not present	Then he [‘Umar] said, “O messenger of God, indeed by God it is Quraysh and their power; by God they are not humble since they are powerful; by God they are not protected since they are disbelievers; by God they will never surrender their power. They will surely fight you! Get ready therefore, and make preparations.”
	ثم قال: يا رسول الله، إنها والله قريش وعزّها، والله ما ذلّت منذ عزّت، والله ما أمنت منذ كفرت، والله لا تسلم عزّها أبداً، ولتقاتلنك، فاتهب لذلك أهبتّه وأعدّ لذلك عدته.

The set of utterances by ‘Umar is provided exclusively by al-Wāqidī who drew the utterances from another source, possibly Mūsā b. ‘Uqba. As observable, ‘Umar’s utterances in al-Wāqidī’s version are largely identical to those in the version ascribed to Mūsā:

<sup>353</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48.

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>354</sup>	Al-Wāqidī
“O messenger of God, it is Quraysh and their power; by God they are not humble since they are powerful, and they are not protected since they are disbelievers. By God they will surely fight you. Get ready therefore, and make preparations.”	Then he [‘Umar] said, “O messenger of God, by God it is Quraysh and their power; by God they are not humble since they are powerful; by God they are not protected since they are disbelievers; by God they will never surrender their power. They will surely fight you! Get ready therefore, and make preparations.”
يا رسول الله، إنها قريش وعزّها، والله ما ذلت منذ عزّت، ولا أمنت منذ كفرت، والله لتقاتلنك، فتأهب لذلك أهبتة واعد له عدته	يا رسول الله، إنها والله قريش وعزّها، والله ما ذلت منذ عزّت، والله ما أمنت منذ كفرت، والله لا تسلم عزّها أبداً، ولتقاتلنك، فتأهب لذلك أهبتة وأعدّ لذلك عدته.

More conspicuously in al-Wāqidī, the utterances follow a pattern. The repetitions of “by God,” the repetitive use of the negation, and the climactic escalation into ‘Umar’s conclusion are characteristic of the *qāṣṣ*.

### The Council of War—Section 3

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>355</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>356</sup>
Then al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr arose and said, “O messenger of God, proceed as God has shown you, for we are with you. By God we will not say to you as the Israelites said to Moses, ‘Go you and your Lord and fight, we will sit here,’ but go you and your Lord and fight, we will fight with you. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you were to take us to Bark al-Ghimād, we would fight resolutely with you against them until you gained it.” The Prophet replied, “Well done,” and prayed for him.	Then al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr arose and said, “O messenger of God, proceed because of God’s command, for we are with you. By God we will not say to you as the Israelites said to their prophet, ‘Go you and your Lord and fight, we are staying here.’ But go you and your Lord and fight, we will fight with you. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you were to take us to Bark al-Ghimād we would go with you.”—Bark al-Ghimād is five nights from Mecca, behind the coast near the sea, and it is eight nights from Mecca to Yemen. The Prophet replied, “Well done,” and prayed for blessings for him.
ثم قام المقداد بن عمرو، فقال: يا رسول الله، امض لما أراك <sup>357</sup> الله، فنحن معك، والله لا نقول لك كما قالت بنو إسرائيل لموسى: اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا ههنا قاعدون. ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا معكما	ثم قام المقداد بن عمرو فقال: يا رسول الله، امض لأمر الله فنحن معك، والله لا نقول لك كما قالت بنو إسرائيل لنبيها: فاذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا إنا ههنا قاعدون، ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا إنا معكما مقاتلون، والذي

<sup>354</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:107.

<sup>355</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>356</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48.

<sup>357</sup> أمرک. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1300.

مقاتلون، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو سرت بنا إلى برك الغماد <sup>358</sup> لجالدنا معك من دونه، حتى تبلغه، فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرا، ودعا له به. <sup>359</sup>	بعثك بالحق لو سرت بنا إلى برك الغماد لسرنا معك – وبرك الغماد من وراء مكة بخمس ليال من وراء الساحل مما يلي البحر، وهو على ثمان ليال من مكة إلى اليمن. فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرا، ودعا له بخير.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	امض لما أراك الله (via al-Ṭabarī—أمرك)	امض لأمر الله
2	قالت بنو إسرائيل لموسى	قالت بنو إسرائيل لنبيها
3	لجالدنا معك من دونه حتى تبلغه	لسرنا معك
4	Not present (via al-Ṭabarī—يعنى مدينة الحبشة)	وبرك الغماد من وراء مكة بخمس ليال من وراء الساحل مما يلي البحر، وهو على ثمان ليال من مكة إلى اليمن.
5	دعا له به (via al-Ṭabarī—دعا له بخير)	دعا له بخير

Al-Wāqidī probably drew from Ibn Ishāq for this passage. Although the text of al-Wāqidī presents itself as an abridged version of that of Ibn Ishāq for al-Miqdād’s resolve to fight as far as Bark al-Ghimād (3), al-Wāqidī’s narrative echoes that of Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) concerning God’s command (1). Moreover the texts of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) are identical for Muḥammad’s concluding prayer for al-Miqdād (5), and both provide an explanatory gloss of the location of Bark al-Ghimād (4). As a whole, the storyline in Ibn Ishāq’s account is contained not only in but also in the same manner as in al-Wāqidī’s account without the presence of any major variation:

1. Al-Miqdād arose.
2. Al-Miqdād advised Muḥammad to proceed.
3. Al-Miqdād told Muḥammad that the Muslims will go and fight with him and will not be like the Israelites who had failed to go with their prophet.
4. Al-Miqdād vowed that the Muslims would accompany Muḥammad if he were to go to Bark al-Ghimād.
5. Muḥammad praised and prayed for al-Miqdād.

#### The Council of War—Section 4

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>360</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>361</sup>
Then the Prophet said, “Give me advice, O people,” meaning the Anṣār. This is because they are the majority of the	Then the Prophet said, “Give me advice, O people,” and he meant the Anṣār, for he was considering that the Anṣār would

<sup>358</sup> البرك الغماد يعنى مدينة الحبشة. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1300.

<sup>359</sup> دعا له بخير. Ibid.

<sup>360</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>361</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48.

<p>people, and because when they had pledged allegiance to him at al-‘Aqaba, they said, “O messenger of God, we are exempt from protecting you until you reach our dwelling-places. But when you reach us, you will be under our protection. We will protect you from that which we protect our women and children.” The Prophet was afraid that the Anṣār were considering that they would not be an assistance to him except from what came upon him from his enemy in Medina, and that it was not their obligation to go with him against an enemy outside their territory.</p>	<p>not help him except in their territory and that they had stipulated to protect him from that which they protected themselves and their children.</p>
<p>ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ أيها الناس. وإنما يريد الأنصار، وذلك أنهم عدد الناس،<sup>362</sup> وأنهم حين بايعوه بالعقبة، قالوا: يا رسول الله: إنا برآء من ذمامك، حتى تصل إلى ديارنا،<sup>363</sup> فإذا وصلت إلينا، فأنت في ذمتنا،<sup>364</sup> نمنعك ممّا نمنع منه أبناءنا ونساءنا. فكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، يتخوّف ألا<sup>365</sup> تكون الأنصار ترى عليها نصره<sup>366</sup> إلا ممن دهمه بالمدينة من عدوّه، وأن ليس عليهم أن يسير بهم إلى عدوّ من بلادهم.</p>	<p>ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ أيها الناس. وإنما يريد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الأنصار، وكان يظنّ أنّ الأنصار لا تنصره إلا في الدار، وذلك أنهم شرطوا له أن يمنعوه ممّا يمنعون منه أنفسهم وأولادهم.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidi
1	وإنما يريد الأنصار	إنما يريد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الأنصار
2	وذلك أنهم عدد الناس، وأنهم حين بايعوه بالعقبة، قالوا: يا رسول الله: إنا برآء من ذمامك، حتى تصل إلى ديارنا، فإذا وصلت إلينا، فأنت في ذمتنا، نمنعك ممّا نمنع منه أبناءنا ونساءنا. فكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، يتخوّف ألا تكون الأنصار ترى عليها نصره إلا ممن دهمه بالمدينة من عدوّه، وأن ليس عليهم أن يسير بهم إلى عدوّ من بلادهم.	وكان يظنّ أنّ الأنصار لا تنصره إلا في الدار، وذلك أنهم شرطوا له أن يمنعوه ممّا يمنعون منه أنفسهم وأولادهم.

Other than minor variants such as a title with its associated honorific of

Muḥammad (1), and synonyms (2), al-Wāqidi’s version reads much like a summary of

Ibn Ishāq’s version. The two versions share the following storyline:

1. Muḥammad asked the Anṣār for advice.
2. Muḥammad considered that the Anṣār may not help him unless he was in their territory.
3. The Anṣār had informed Muḥammad that they would protect him from that which they protected their own people.

<sup>362</sup> كانوا عدد الناس. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1301.

<sup>363</sup> دارنا. Ibid.

<sup>364</sup> ذمامنا. Ibid.

<sup>365</sup> أن لا. Ibid.

<sup>366</sup> نصرته. Ibid.

Although al-Wāqidī's version appears to be a summary of Ibn Ishāq's version, the shortness of al-Wāqidī's account prohibits one from ascertaining whether it is dependent upon Ibn Ishāq's account, except to maintain the plausibility of dependence.

The Council of War—Section 5

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>367</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>368</sup>
<p>When the Prophet said that, Sa'd b. Mu'adh said to him, "By God, you seem to mean us, O messenger of God." "Yes," he replied. Sa'd said, "We have believed in you and have accepted what you say as true, and we have testified that the message you brought is the truth. We have accordingly given you our word and covenant to listen and obey. Proceed O messenger of God as you wish, for we are with you; and by Him who sent you with the truth, if you lead us to the sea and plunge into it, we would plunge into it with you; not one man among us would stay behind. We are not unwilling for you to meet the enemy with us tomorrow. We are steadfast in war, trustworthy in battle. Perhaps God intends for you something from us, that which will gladden you, so take us along with God's blessing."</p>	<p>The Prophet said, "Give me advice!" Then Sa'd b. Mu'adh arose and said, "I will answer on behalf of the Anṣār, as you O messenger of God, mean us!" He [Muḥammad] said, "Yes." He [Sa'd] said, "It may be that you have gone out for an order revealed to you which was different. We have believed in you and have accepted what you say as true. We have testified that everything you have brought is truth, and we have given you our covenant and word to listen and obey. So proceed O prophet of God. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you lead us to the sea and plunge into it, we would plunge into it with you. No man among us would stay behind. Take whoever you wish, leave behind whoever you wish, and take what you wish from our possessions. What you take from our possessions is more dear to us than what you leave behind. By Him in whose hand is my soul, I have never traveled this path and I have no knowledge of it. We are not unwilling that our enemy meet us tomorrow. We are steadfast in war, trustworthy in battle. Perhaps God intends for you something from us, that which will gladden you."</p>
<p>فلما قال ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال له سعد بن معاذ: والله لكأنك تريدنا يا رسول الله، قال: أجل. قال: فقد آمنا بك وصدقناك، وشهدنا أن ما جئت به هو الحق، وأعطيناك على ذلك عهدنا ومواثيقنا، على السمع والطاعة، فامض يا رسول الله لما أردت، فنحن معك،<sup>369</sup> فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو<sup>370</sup> استعرضت بنا هذا</p>	<p>فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ! فقام سعد بن معاذ فقال: أنا أجيب عن الأنصار، كأنك يا رسول الله تريدنا! قال: أجل. قال: إنك عسى أن تكون خرجت عن أمر قد أوحى إليك في غيره، وإننا قد آمنا بك وصدقناك، وشهدنا أن كل ما جئت به حق، وأعطيناك مواثيقنا وعهدنا على السمع والطاعة،</p>

<sup>367</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>368</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:48-49.

<sup>369</sup> أردت. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1302.

<sup>370</sup> إن. Ibid.

البحر فخصته، لخصناه معك، ما تخلف منا رجل واحد، وما نكره أن تلقى بنا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر في <sup>371</sup> الحرب، صدق في <sup>372</sup> اللقاء. لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك، فسر بنا على بركة الله.	فامض يا نبي الله، فالذى بعثك بالحق لو استعرضت هذا البحر فخصته لخصناه معك، ما بقي منا رجل، وصل من شئت، واقطع من شئت، وخذ من أموالنا ما شئت، وما أخذت من أموالنا أحب إلينا مما تركت. والذى نفسى بيده، ما سلكت هذا الطريق قط، ومالي بها من علم، وما نكره أن يلقانا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر عند الحرب، صدق عند اللقاء، لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidi
1	فلما قال ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال له سعد بن معاذ	فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا علي فقام سعد بن معاذ فقال
2	Not present	أنا أجيب عن الأنصار
3	والله لكانك تريدنا يا رسول الله	كانك يا رسول الله تريدنا
4	Not present	قال: إنك عسى أن تكون خرجت عن أمر قد أوحى إليك في غيره
5	شهدنا أن ما جئت به هو الحق	شهدنا أن كل ما جئت به حق
6	أعطيناك على ذلك عهدنا وموآثيقنا، على السمع والطاعة	أعطيناك موآثيقنا وعهدنا على السمع والطاعة
7	فامض يا رسول الله	فامض يا نبي الله
8	لو استعرضت بنا هذا البحر فخصته، لخصناه معك	لو استعرضت هذا البحر فخصته لخصناه معك
9	ما تخلف منا رجل واحد	ما بقي منا رجل
10	Not present	وصل من شئت، واقطع من شئت، وخذ من أموالنا ما شئت، وما أخذت من أموالنا أحب إلينا مما تركت
11	Not present	والذى نفسى بيده، ما سلكت هذا الطريق قط، ومالي بها من علم
12	وما نكره أن تلقى بنا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر في الحرب، صدق في اللقاء (وما نكره أن يلقانا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر عند الحرب، صدق عند اللقاء	وما نكره أن يلقانا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر عند الحرب، صدق عند اللقاء
13	(via al-Ṭabarī— لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك	لعل الله يريك منا ما تقر به عينك
14	فسر بنا على بركة الله	Not present

The presence of literal and non-literal parallels indicates that one source is dependent upon the other. The literal parallels are found in the latter part of the passage (12 [via al-Ṭabarī], 13). The non-literal parallels are:

1. Sa'd b. Mu'adh sought to reply to Muḥammad on behalf of the Anṣār.
2. Muḥammad affirmed that Sa'd should answer.
3. Sa'd replied that the Anṣār:
  - a. believed in Muḥammad and accepted what he says as true.
  - b. testified that what he brought is the truth.
  - c. gave him their word and covenant to listen and obey.
4. Sa'd informed Muḥammad that:
  - a. the Anṣār would plunge into the sea if he plunged into it.
  - b. not one of their men would stay behind.

<sup>371</sup> عند. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1302.

<sup>372</sup> عند. Ibid.

- c. the Anṣār are not unwilling to meet the enemy tomorrow.
- d. the Anṣār are steadfast in war and trustworthy in battle.

The variants with respect to the non-literal parallels are minor and thus can be ignored in the question of whether al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Ishāq. They amount to differences in word order (1, 3), synonyms (7, 9), and one version includes while the other does not a preposition (3), adjectival quantifier (5), definite article (5), and prepositional phrases (6, 8). As for the concluding words by Saʿd in Ibn Ishāq (14), they appear to have been omitted by al-Wāqidī.

Most likely, al-Wāqidī constructed his own version of the events utilizing not only Ibn Ishāq but also other sources, for there are phrases and sentences in al-Wāqidī that have no parallel in Ibn Ishāq (2, 4, 10, 11), and al-Wāqidī may have drawn some of this material (10) from Mūsā:

Al-Wāqidī	Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>373</sup>
No man among us would stay behind. Take whoever you wish, leave behind whoever you wish, and take what you wish from our possessions. What you take from our possessions is more dear to us than what you leave behind.	Take whoever you wish and leave behind whoever you wish. Take what you wish from our possessions, and give us what you wish. What you take from us is dearer to us than what you leave for us.
وصل من شئت، واقطع من شئت، وخذ من أموالنا ما شئت، وما أخذت من أموالنا أحب إلينا مما تركت.	يا رسول الله، فأظعن حيث شئت وصل حبل من شئت، واقطع حبل من شئت، وخذ من أموالنا ما شئت، وأعطنا ما شئت، وما أخذته منا أحب إلينا مما تركت علينا.

Significantly the extra sentence in al-Wāqidī in which Saʿd supposed that Muḥammad’s departure had been due to a different command given to him by God (4) may exhibit the idea of *badāʿ*, a theology greatly stressed by the Shīʿa in which the emergence of new circumstances causes a change in an earlier divine ruling.<sup>374</sup> According to the council story, God’s initial command to Muḥammad was to attack the caravan of Abū Sufyān, but the command became irrelevant when the Muslims changed the object of their attack from the caravan to the army of Quraysh.

<sup>373</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalāʾil al-nubuwwa*, 3:107.

<sup>374</sup> *Et*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “*badāʿ*.”

## The Council of War—Section 6

<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</p> <p>Not present</p>	<p>Al-Wāqidī<sup>375</sup></p> <p>Muḥammad—al-Wāqidī—Muḥammad b. Sāliḥ—ʿAsim b. ʿUmar b. Qatada—Maḥmūd b. Labīd: Saʿd said, “O messenger of God, we left behind from our people, a people, and we do not have greater love for you than they, nor are we more obedient to you than they. They have a determination for <i>jihād</i> and an intention. If they had thought, O messenger of God, that you would meet an enemy, then they would not have stayed behind, but they thought that it was the caravan. We will build a hut for you in which to stay, and we will prepare your camel. Then we will meet our enemy, and if God strengthens us and grants us victory against our enemy, then that is what we desire, but if it is otherwise, then saddle your camel and meet those who are behind us.” The Prophet said to him, “Good.” And he said, “Or may God carry out something better than that O Saʿd!”</p>
	<p>حدَّثنا محمد قال: حدَّثنا الواقدي قال: فحدَّثني محمد بن صالح، عن عاصم بن عمر بن قتادة، عن محمود بن لبيد قال: قال سعد: يا رسول الله، إنَّا قد خلفنا من قومنا قوما ما نحن بأشدَّ حبًّا لك منهم، ولا أطوع لك منهم، لهم رغبة في الجهاد ونية، ولو ظنَّوا يا رسول الله أنك ملاق عدوًّا ما تخلفوا، ولكن إنما ظنَّوا أنَّها العير. نبني لك عريشا فتكون فيه ونعدُّ لك رواحك، ثم نلقى عدونا، فإن أعزنا الله وأظهرنا على عدونا كان ذلك ما أحببنا، وإن تكن الأخرى جلست على رواحك فلحقت من وراءنا. فقال له النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرا، وقال: أو يقضى الله خيرا من ذلك يا سعد!</p>

This tradition, which is solely in al-Wāqidī, breaks from his combined report and appears to contain pro-Anṣārī bias. The attestation of love towards the Prophet by Saʿd b. Muʿadh, the representative of the Anṣār, has the effect of esteeming the Anṣār and elevating their status. A parallel tradition in another source was unable to be found.

<sup>375</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:49.

## The Council of War—Section 7

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>376</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>377</sup>
The Prophet was gladdened by Sa’d’s reply, and it strengthened him. Then he said, “March, and rejoice, for God Most High has promised me one of the two parties, and by God it is as though I now see the places of slaughter of the people.”	They said: When Sa’d finished his counsel, the Prophet said, “March, with the blessing of God. Verily God has promised me one of two parties. By God it is as though I see the places of slaughter of the people.”
فسرّ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقول سعد، ونشّطه ذلك، ثم قال: سيروا <sup>378</sup> وأبشروا، فإن الله تعالى <sup>379</sup> قد وعدنى إحدى الطائفتين، والله لكأنى الآن أنظر إلى مصارع القوم.	قالوا: فلما فرغ سعد من المشورة، قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: سيروا على بركة الله، فإنّ الله قد وعدنى إحدى الطائفتين. والله، لكأنى أنظر إلى مصارع القوم.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	فسرّ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقول سعد، ونشّطه ذلك	Not present
2	Not present	فلما فرغ سعد من المشورة
3	ثم قال: سيروا (سيروا على بركة الله— via al-Ṭabarī— وأبشروا	قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: سيروا على بركة الله
4	فإن الله تعالى قد وعدنى إحدى الطائفتين (فإنّ الله قد وعدنى إحدى الطائفتين— via al-Ṭabarī—	فإنّ الله قد وعدنى إحدى الطائفتين
5	والله لكأنى الآن أنظر إلى مصارع القوم	والله، لكأنى أنظر إلى مصارع القوم

For this passage, there are two identical sentences (3 & 4 [via al-Ṭabarī]), and the differences between the versions are minor, suggesting the feasibility that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq. The minor differences consist of two additional temporal adverbs (3, 5) in Ibn Ishāq. As for the differences at the beginning of the passage (1, 2), they most probably can be attributed to the editorial action of al-Wāqidī who, after his inclusion of the previous individual report, returned to narrating the council story in the manner of the combined report technique.<sup>380</sup> Consequently the differences at the beginning of the passage are not useful for comparison in answering the question of dependence.

<sup>376</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>377</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:49.

<sup>378</sup> سيروا على بركة الله. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1302.

<sup>379</sup> الله. *Ibid.*

<sup>380</sup> In al-Wāqidī, Muḥammad’s delight at the words of Sa’d is already provided in the previous individual report. Probably al-Wāqidī saw no need to repeat the account and omitted it when constructing the present report.

## Single Combat—Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>381</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>382</sup>
Al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī, who was a malicious, ill-natured man, stepped forth and said, “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern, or destroy it, or die without doing so.” When he came forth, Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib came forth to him. When the two met, Ḥamza struck him and cut off his foot and half his leg before he reached the cistern. Al-Aswad fell on his back with blood from his leg gushing towards his companions. Then he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it, intending to fulfill his oath, but Ḥamza followed him and struck him and killed him in the cistern.	When the people advanced, al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī said, when he drew near the cistern, “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern, destroy it, or die without doing so.” Al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad charged until he came near the cistern. Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib confronted him and struck him, chopping off his foot. Al-Aswad crawled until he stopped at the cistern. He destroyed it with his good leg and drank from it. Ḥamza followed him and struck him in the cistern, killing him. The polytheists, observing from their ranks, thought that they were victorious. Then some of the people advanced towards one another.
وقد خرج الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي، وكان رجلاً شرساً سيء الخلق، فقال: أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته، <sup>383</sup> أو لأموتنّ دونه، فلما خرج، خرج إليه <sup>384</sup> حمزة بن عبد المطلب، فلما التقيا ضربه حمزة فأطنّ قدمه بنصف ساقه، وهو دون الحوض، فوقع على ظهره تشخب رجله دما نحو أصحابه، ثم حبا إلى الحوض، حتى اقتحم فيه، يريد أن <sup>385</sup> يبرّ يمينه، وأتبعه حمزة فضربه، حتى قتله في الحوض.	قالوا: فلما تزاحف الناس قال الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي حين دنا من الحوض: أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته، أو لأموتنّ دونه. فشدّ الأسود بن عبد الأسد حتى دنا من الحوض، فاستقبله حمزة ابن عبد المطلب، فضربه فأطنّ قدمه، فزحف الأسود حتى وقع في الحوض فهدمه برجله الصحيحة، وشرب منه، وأتبعه حمزة فضربه في الحوض فقتله. والمشركون ينظرون على صفوفهم وهم يرون أنّهم ظاهرون. فدنا الناس بعضهم من بعض.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	Not present	فلما تزاحف الناس
2	وقد خرج	Not present
3	وكان رجلاً شرساً سيء الخلق	Not present
4	فلما خرج	فشدّ
5	أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته، أو لأموتنّ دونه	أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته، أو لأموتنّ دونه
6	خرج إليه	فاستقبله
7	فلما التقيا	Not present
8	بنصف ساقه، وهو دون الحوض، فوقع على ظهره تشخب رجله دما نحو أصحابه	Not present
9	ضربه حمزة فأطنّ قدمه	فضربه فأطنّ قدمه
10	Not present	فزحف الأسود حتى وقع في الحوض فهدمه برجله الصحيحة، وشرب منه
11	ثم حبا إلى الحوض، حتى اقتحم فيه، يريد أن يبرّ	Not present

<sup>381</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:624-25.

<sup>382</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:68.

<sup>383</sup> ولأهدمته. Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3:1316.

<sup>384</sup> له. Ibid.

<sup>385</sup> زعم أن. Ibid., 1317.

	بمينه	
12	فَضْرِبْهُ، حَتَّى قَتْلَهُ فِي الْحَوْضِ	فَضْرِبْهُ فِي الْحَوْضِ فَقَتَلَهُ
13	Not present	وَالْمَشْرُكُونَ يَنْظُرُونَ عَلَى صَفْوَفِهِمْ وَهُمْ يَرُونَ أَنَّهُمْ ظَاهِرُونَ. فَدَنَا النَّاسُ بَعْضُهُمْ مِنْ بَعْضٍ.
14	قَتْلَهُ فِي الْحَوْضِ	فِي الْحَوْضِ فَقَتَلَهُ

A general indication that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq is that the two versions share three central motifs: 1) Al-Aswad swore that he will surely drink from the cistern, destroy the cistern, or die; 2) Ḥamza intercepted al-Aswad and cut off part of his leg; and 3) Ḥamza followed al-Aswad into the cistern and killed him. More significant indications of dependence are that the versions have in common some word-for-word parallels and words themselves (5, 9, 14). The largest parallel is the vow by al-Aswad: “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern, destroy it, or die if not.”

Both versions exhibit minor variants in the form of synonyms (4, 6) and an additional preposition (12). Other variants involve the presence of phrases and sentences in one version that are lacking in the other (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13). Some of these variants (2, 3, 7, 8, 11) possibly demonstrate al-Wāqidī’s activity in abridging Ibn Ishāq’s narrative, and one of the variants (1) was most probably created by al-Wāqidī as connecting material.

A significant variation between the versions is that the character al-Aswad receives greater attention in the version of Ibn Ishāq. Only in Ibn Ishāq’s version is al-Aswad depicted as a malicious and ill-natured man. Ibn Ishāq’s version alone also includes the graphic scene in which al-Aswad fell on his back with blood streaming from his leg towards his companions. Another significant variation is that al-Aswad both destroyed the cistern and successfully drank from it in al-Wāqidī’s version, but al-Aswad accomplished neither in Ibn Ishāq’s version. Al-Wāqidī possibly drew al-Aswad’s demolition of the cistern (10) from Mūsā, whose version in al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il* reports similarly: *hadama minhu*.<sup>386</sup> As for the excerpt exclusively in al-Wāqidī in which the

<sup>386</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113.

polytheists observed from their ranks (13), a parallel in another source was unable to be found.

### Single Combat—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>387</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>388</sup>
Then after him ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a stepped forth between his brother Shayba and his son al-Walīd b. ‘Utba, and when he stood clear of the ranks gave the challenge for single combat. Three men of the Anṣār came out against him, and they were ‘Awf and Mu‘awwidh, the sons of al-Ḥārith—their mother was ‘Afrā’—and another man; he is said to have been ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa. Then they [Quraysh] asked, “Who are you?” And they answered, “Some of the Anṣār.” They [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”	Then ‘Utba, Shayba and al-Walīd came forward until they stood clear of the ranks. They issued the challenge for single combat. Then three men of the Anṣār stepped forward to them, and they were the sons of ‘Afrā’: Mu‘ādh, Mu‘awwidh and ‘Awf, the Banū al-Ḥārith—it is said the third of them was ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa. And we are certain that they were the sons of ‘Afrā’.
ثم خرج بعده عتبة بن ربيعة، بين أخيه شيبعة بن ربيعة وابنه الوليد بن عتبة، حتى إذا فصل من الصف، دعا إلى المبارزة، فخرج إليه فتية من الأنصار ثلاثة، وهم: عوف، <sup>389</sup> ومعوذ، ابنا الحارث – و أمهما عفراء – ورجل آخر، يقال: هو عبد الله بن رواحة، <sup>391</sup> فقالوا: من أنتم؟ فقالوا: رهط من الأنصار، قالوا: <sup>393</sup> ما لنا بكم من حاجة.	فخرج عتبة وشيبعة والوليد حتى فصلوا من الصف، ثم دعوا إلى المبارزة، فخرج إليهم فتية ثلاث من الأنصار، وهم بنو عفراء: معاذ ومعوذ وعوف، بنو الحارث – ويقال ثالثهم عبد الله بن رواحة، والثبت عندنا أنهم بنو عفراء.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	ثم خرج بعده عتبة بن ربيعة، بين أخيه شيبعة بن ربيعة وابنه الوليد بن عتبة	فخرج عتبة وشيبعة والوليد
2	حتى إذا فصل من الصف	حتى فصلوا من الصف
3	دعا إلى المبارزة	ثم دعوا إلى المبارزة
4	فخرج إليهم فتية من الأنصار ثلاثة	فخرج إليهم فتية ثلاث من الأنصار
5	وهم: عوف، ومعوذ، ابنا الحارث – و أمهما عفراء	وهم بنو عفراء: معاذ ومعوذ وعوف، بنو الحارث
6	ورجل آخر، يقال: هو عبد الله بن رواحة	ويقال ثالثهم عبد الله بن رواحة
7	Not present	والثبت عندنا أنهم بنو عفراء
8	فقالوا: من أنتم؟ فقالوا: رهط من الأنصار، قالوا: ما لنا بكم من حاجة.	Not present

<sup>387</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625.

<sup>388</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:68.

<sup>389</sup> ثلاثة نفر منهم. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1317.

<sup>390</sup> يقال له. Ibid.

<sup>391</sup> عبد الله بن رواحة. Ibid.

<sup>392</sup> قالوا. Ibid.

<sup>393</sup> فقالوا. Ibid.

For this passage, al-Wāqidī seems to have drawn from Ibn Ishāq. One notices immediately that the text of al-Wāqidī is markedly similar to the text of Ibn Ishāq in that they follow a uniform narrative and utilize the same vocabulary. Moreover the account of al-Wāqidī gives the appearance of being a summary of the account of Ibn Ishāq. Names and familial relations are either shortened or omitted, and the narrative runs in synoptic fashion. In Ibn Ishāq, the full names of the Meccans and their familial relations are provided: ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, his brother Shayba b. Rabī‘a, and ‘Utba’s son al-Walīd b. ‘Utba (1). In al-Wāqidī however, the three are simply referred to as ‘Utba, Shayba and al-Walīd. In addition Ibn Ishāq has the three specifically positioned, i.e. ‘Utba is situated between Shayba and al-Walīd, whereas in al-Wāqidī, the manner in which the three are positioned is absent.

A further difference affects the storyline. Of the three Meccans, ‘Utba, according to the version of Ibn Ishāq, is set apart as the main antagonist. The two actions that position him as the chief antagonist are that he stood clear (*faṣala*) of the army ranks and issued (*da‘ā*) the challenge for single combat (2, 3). In al-Wāqidī however, a chief antagonist is lacking. As the verbs *faṣalū* and *da‘ū* indicate, all three Meccans comprise the antagonists of the story, with no one person playing a greater role than the others. Although the two sources in this way are reporting different narratives, the differences may merely be a result of summarization on the part of al-Wāqidī.

It seems that al-Wāqidī was concerned to add “knowledge” to text of Ibn Ishāq. In the identification of the three Anṣārīs who met the challenge for single combat, al-Wāqidī pronounces upon a tradition in which at least one of the identities is uncertain (6) by providing his own judgment of which identities are to be considered trustworthy (7).<sup>394</sup> Concerning al-Wāqidī’s references to the sons of ‘Afrā’ and Banū al-Ḥārith (5), it

---

<sup>394</sup> Al-Wāqidī made pronouncements on the trustworthiness of a tradition. See Cook, *Muhammad*, 63–64. Cf. a report about al-Wāqidī in which he set out to discover additional information about an event in the Prophet’s life by interviewing the descendents of the Prophet’s Companions. If the report is verifiable, al-

seems that he has understood Ibn Ishāq on maternity. The remainder of the passage in Ibn Ishāq, the dialogue between the Meccans and the Anṣārīs (8), is lacking in al-Wāqidī. In its place is a tradition (see Section 3) that conversely is non-existent in Ibn Ishāq.

### Single Combat—Section 3

Ibn Ishāq	Al-Wāqidī <sup>395</sup>
Not present	The Prophet was ashamed about that, and he was unwilling that the first of the Muslims to encounter the polytheists in battle be the Anṣār. He wanted the valor to go to the sons of his uncle and his people, so he gave an order, and they returned to their ranks. He said to them, “Well done.”
	فاستحیی رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من ذلك، وكره أن يكون أول قتال لقي المسلمون فيه المشركين في الأنصار، وأحب أن تكون الشوكة لبني عمه وقومه، فأمرهم فرجعوا إلى مصافهم، وقال لهم خيرًا!

Al-Wāqidī may have drawn this part of the story from Mūsā, to whom is attributed a similar report:

Al-Wāqidī	Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>396</sup>
The Prophet was ashamed about that, and he was unwilling that the first of the Muslims to encounter the polytheists in battle be the Anṣār. He wanted the valor to go to the sons of his uncle and his people, so he gave an order, and they returned to their ranks. He said to them, “Well done.”	The Prophet was ashamed about that because the God-fearing were the first to fight between the Muslims and the polytheists. The Prophet was present with them, and he wanted the valor to go to the sons of his uncle. The Prophet called for them to return to their ranks.
فاستحیی رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من ذلك، وكره أن يكون أول قتال لقي المسلمون فيه المشركين في الأنصار، وأحب أن تكون الشوكة لبني عمه وقومه، فأمرهم فرجعوا إلى مصافهم، وقال لهم خيرًا.	فاستحیی النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من ذلك لأنه كان أول قتال التقى فيه المسلمون والمشركون، ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم شاهد معهم، فأحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن تكون الشوكة لبني عمه فناداهم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن ارجعوا إلى مصافكم.

Wāqidī’s precision may be a result of his scholarly exercise of probing alternate sources with the goal of elucidating ambiguous traditions. *EF*, s.v. “Al-Wāqidī.”

<sup>395</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:68.

<sup>396</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113. Ibn Kathīr recounts the report on the authority of al-Umawī in Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 3:273.

## Single Combat—Section 4

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>397</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>398</sup>
<p>Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith, and arise, O Ḥamza, and arise, O ‘Alī.” And when they arose and approached them, Quraysh asked, “Who are you?” ‘Ubayda replied, “‘Ubayda,” Ḥamza replied, “Ḥamza,” and ‘Alī replied, “‘Alī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.”</p>	<p>Then the representative of the polytheists shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth to us peers from our tribe.” The Prophet said to them, “O Banū Hāshim, rise and fight for your truth that God sent to your prophet, since they have come with their falsehood to extinguish the light of God.” Then Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith b. Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abd Manāf arose and proceeded towards them. ‘Utba said, “Speak, so that we may recognize you—a helmet was on each of them, masking them—for if you are peers, then we will fight you.” And so Ḥamza said, “I am Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the lion of God and the lion of His messenger.” ‘Utba replied, “A noble peer.” Then ‘Utba said, “I am the lion of the Allies, and who are these two with you?” He [Ḥamza] said, “‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith.” He [‘Utba] said, “Noble peers.”</p>
<p>ثم نادي مناديهم: يا محمد، أخرج إلينا أكفائنا من قومنا، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث،<sup>399</sup> وقم يا حمزة،<sup>400</sup> وقم يا علي،<sup>401</sup> فلما قاموا ودنوا منهم، قالوا: من أنتم؟ قال عبيدة: عبيدة، وقال حمزة: حمزة، وقال علي: علي، قالوا: نعم، أكفاء كرام.</p>	<p>ثم نادي منادي المشركين: يا محمد، أخرج لنا الأكفاء من قومنا، فقال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: يا بني هاشم، قوموا فقاتلوا بحقكم، الذي بعث الله به نبيكم، إذ جاءوا بباطلهم ليطفئوا نور الله. فقام حمزة بن عبد المطلب، وعلي بن أبي طالب، وعبيدة بن الحارث ابن المطلب بن عبد مناف، فمشوا إليهم، فقال عتبة: تكلموا نعرفكم – وكان عليهم البيض فأنكروهم – فإن كنتم أكفاء قاتلناكم. فقال حمزة: أنا حمزة بن عبد المطلب، أسد الله وأسد رسوله. قال عتبة: كفاء كريم. ثم قال عتبة: وأنا أسد الحلفاء، ومن هذان معك؟ قال: علي ابن أبي طالب وعبيدة بن الحارث. قال: كفان كريمان.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	ثم نادي مناديهم	ثم نادي منادي المشركين
2	يا محمد، أخرج إلينا أكفائنا من قومنا	يا محمد، أخرج لنا الأكفاء من قومنا
3	قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث، وقم يا حمزة، وقم يا علي	يا بني هاشم، قوموا
4	Not present	فقاتلوا بحقكم، الذي بعث الله به نبيكم، إذ جاءوا بباطلهم ليطفئوا نور الله
5	فلما قاموا ودنوا منهم	فقام حمزة بن عبد المطلب، وعلي بن أبي طالب، وعبيدة بن الحارث ابن المطلب بن عبد مناف،

<sup>397</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625.

<sup>398</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:68-69.

<sup>399</sup> قم يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1317.

<sup>400</sup> قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث. Ibid.

<sup>401</sup> قم يا علي ابن أبي طالب. Ibid.

		فمشوا إليهم فقال عتبة: تكلموا نعرفكم – وكان عليهم البيض فأنكروهم – فإن كنتم أكفاء فاتلناكم.
6	قالوا: من أنتم؟	
7	قال عبيدة: عبيدة، وقال حمزة: حمزة، وقال عليّ: عليّ	فقال حمزة: أنا حمزة بن عبد المطلب، أسد الله وأسد رسوله. قال عتبة: كفاء كريم. ثم قال عتبة: وأنا أسد الحلفاء، و من هذان معك؟ قال: عليّ ابن أبي طالب وعبيدة بن الحارث.
8	قالوا: نعم، أكفاء كرام.	قال: كفآن كريمان.

Al-Wāqidī's version is approximately twice the length of Ibn Ishāq's version.

Although the sequence of events in both versions is the same, the additional material in al-Wāqidī maintains a significant amount of divergences from the narrative in Ibn Ishāq to either reflect a different tradition or show al-Wāqidī's activity in expanding Ibn Ishāq's narrative. The following characterizations are uniquely of al-Wāqidī's version:

1. The Prophet incited the Banū Hāshim with a kerygmatic utterance (4).<sup>402</sup>
2. The names of the Muslim fighters are provided in full (5).
3. An explanatory gloss is supplied probably due to a complication in the story that the Muslim warriors who are well-known and chief figures of the same tribe should need to identify themselves (6).
4. Ḥamza spoke on behalf of the Muslims and referred to himself as “the lion of God and the lion of His messenger”<sup>403</sup> (7) while ‘Utba spoke on behalf of the Meccans and offered his own designation as “the lion of the Allies.”

Notably al-Wāqidī's version may exhibit a sign of redaction. When mentioning the Banū Hāshim (3), the tradition refers to Ḥamza, ‘Ubayda and ‘Alī, as if it *already knew* the three to be those whom Muḥammad ordered to rise and fight. The tradition's “foreknowledge” may be evidence that its composer rearranged an already existent tradition.

#### Single Combat—Section 5

Ibn Ishāq	Al-Wāqidī <sup>404</sup>
Not present	Ibn Abī al-Zinād—his father: I have never

<sup>402</sup> An element of salvation history is displayed in an utterance by the Prophet: “Rise and fight for your truth that God sent to your Prophet, since they have come with their falsehood to extinguish the light of God.” The utterance has the kerygmatic effect of promoting the religion of Islam and the figure of the Prophet (in contradistinction to the falsehood held by the Meccan polytheists). For a study on salvation history in the life of the Prophet, see Wansbrough, *Sectarian Milieu*.

<sup>403</sup> The emphasis on Ḥamza may be due to the proclivity of the early Muslims in preserving the memory and honor of their fellow tribesmen. Lecker, “The Death,” 11.

<sup>404</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:69.

	heard ‘Utba utter anything weaker than his saying: “I am the lion of the Allies,” meaning the Allies of the Confederation.
	قال ابن الزناد، عن أبيه، قال: لم أسمع لعتبة كلمة قط أو هن من قوله أنا أسد الحلفاء، يعنى بالحلفاء الأجمة.

The report is found exclusively in the version of al-Wāqidī, who sought to elucidate the meaning of “the Allies” (*al-ḥulafā*). The report is not part of al-Wāqidī’s combined report and is equipped with its own *isnād*. Moreover the report is another indication of al-Wāqidī’s tendency to insert “knowledge” in his narrative.

### Single Combat—Section 6

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>405</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>406</sup>
<p>‘Ubayda was the eldest of them, and he faced ‘Utba b. Rabī’a, while Ḥamza faced Shayba b. Rabī’a and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd b. ‘Utba. As for Ḥamza, it was not long before he slew Shayba, and as for ‘Alī, it was not long before he slew al-Walīd. ‘Ubayda and ‘Utba exchanged blows and each maimed his opponent. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on ‘Utba with their swords and dispatched him. They [Ḥamza and ‘Alī] carried their companion [‘Ubayda] and united him with his friends. [Via al-Ṭabarī—His leg had been cut off and the marrow was oozing from it. When they brought ‘Ubayda to the Prophet, he asked, “Am I not a martyr, O messenger of God?” “Indeed you are,” he replied. Then ‘Ubayda said, “If Abū Ṭālib were alive, then he would know that his words:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">We keep him safe until we are struck down around him, and we forget our sons and wives, are truly realized in me.”]</p>	<p>Then ‘Utba said to his son, “Rise, O Walīd,” and al-Walīd arose. ‘Alī stood up against him, and he was the youngest of the group. ‘Alī, peace be upon him, slew him [al-Walīd]. Then ‘Utba arose, and Ḥamza stood up against him. After they exchanged blows, Ḥamza, may God be pleased with him, slew him [‘Utba]. Then Shayba arose, and ‘Ubayda b. al-Hārith stood up against him—in that day he was the eldest of the Prophet’s companions—and Shayba struck ‘Ubayda’s leg with the tip of the sword. It reached the muscle of his thigh and cut it. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on Shayba and slew him. They carried ‘Ubayda and united him with the ranks. With the marrow oozing from his thigh, ‘Ubayda asked, “O messenger of God, am I not a martyr?” He replied, “Indeed you are.” He said, “Now then by God, if Abū Ṭālib were alive, then he would know that I was right in what he said when he uttered:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You lied, by the house of God, when you said, “We will give up Muḥammad.” We strike under him, and we defend him, and we keep him safe until we are struck down around him, and we forget our sons and wives.”</p>
فبارز عبدة، <sup>407</sup> وكان أسن القوم، عتبة (بن) ربيعة،	ثم قال عتبة لابنه: قم يا وليد، فقام الوليد، فقام إليه علي،

<sup>405</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625.

<sup>406</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:69-70.

<p>وكان أصغر النفر، فقتله عليّ عليه السلام. ثم قام عتبة، وقام إليه حمزة، فاختلفا ضربتين فقتله حمزة رضي الله عنه. ثم قام شيبة، وقام إليه عبيدة بن الحارث – وهو يومئذ أسن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – فضرب شيبة رجل عبيدة بذياب السيف، فأصاب عضلة ساقه فقطعها. وكرّ حمزة وعليّ على شيبة فقتلاه، واحتملا عبيدة فحازاه إلى الصف، ومخّ ساقه يسيل، فقال عبيدة: يا رسول الله، ألسنت شهيدا؟ قال: بلى. قال: أما والله، لو كان أبو طالب حيّا لعلم أنا أحقّ بما قال منه حين يقول:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">كذبتم وبيت الله نخلى محمّدا ولمّا نطاعن دونه وناضل ونسلمه حتى نصرّع حوله ونذهل عن أبنائنا والحلائل.</p>	<p>و بارز حمزة شيبة بن ربيعة، وبارز عليّ الوليد بن عتبة. فأما حمزة فلم يمهل شيبة أن قتله، وأما عليّ فلم يمهل الوليد أن قتله، واختلف عبيدة وعتبة بينهما ضربتين، كلاهما أثبت صاحبه، وكرّ حمزة وعليّ بأسياهما على عتبة فذفقا عليه، واحتملا<sup>408</sup> صاحبهما<sup>409</sup> فحازاه إلى<sup>410</sup> أصحابه. (وقد قطعت رجله فمخّها يسيل، فلما اتوا بعبيدة إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال الست شهيدا يا رسول الله قال بلى فقال عبيدة لو كان أبو طالب حيّا لعلم أيّ أحقّ بما قال منه حيث يقول:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ونسلمه حتى نصرّع حوله ونذهل عن أبنائنا والحلائل.)<sup>411</sup></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
1	<p>فبارز عبيدة، وكان أسن القوم، عتبة (بن) ربيعة، وبارز حمزة شيبة بن ربيعة، وبارز عليّ الوليد بن عتبة. فأما حمزة فلم يمهل شيبة أن قتله، وأما عليّ فلم يمهل الوليد أن قتله، واختلف عبيدة وعتبة بينهما ضربتين، كلاهما أثبت صاحبه</p>	<p>ثم قال عتبة لابنه: قم يا وليد، فقام الوليد، فقام إليه عليّ، وكان أصغر النفر، فقتله عليّ عليه السلام. ثم قام عتبة، وقام إليه حمزة، فاختلفا ضربتين فقتله حمزة رضي الله عنه. ثم قام شيبة، وقام إليه عبيدة بن الحارث – وهو يومئذ أسن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – فضرب شيبة رجل عبيدة بذياب السيف، فأصاب عضلة ساقه فقطعها.</p>
2	<p>وكرّ حمزة وعليّ بأسياهما على عتبة فذفقا عليه، واحتملا صاحبهما فحازاه إلى أصحابه.</p>	<p>وكرّ حمزة وعليّ على شيبة فقتلاه، واحتملا عبيدة فحازاه إلى الصف</p>
3	<p>(وقد قطعت رجله فمخّها يسيل، فلما اتوا بعبيدة إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال الست شهيدا يا رسول الله قال بلى (via al-Ṭabarī–</p>	<p>ومخّ ساقه يسيل، فقال عبيدة: يا رسول الله، ألسنت شهيدا؟ قال: بلى.</p>
4	<p>(فقال عبيدة لو كان أبو طالب حيّا لعلم أيّ أحقّ بما قال منه حيث يقول: ونسلمه حتى نصرّع حوله ونذهل عن أبنائنا والحلائل. (via al-Ṭabarī–</p>	<p>قال: أما والله، لو كان أبو طالب حيّا لعلم أنا أحقّ بما قال منه حين يقول: كذبتم وبيت الله نخلى محمّدا ولمّا نطاعن دونه وناضل ونسلمه حتى نصرّع حوله ونذهل عن أبنائنا والحلائل.</p>

The two versions share three motifs: 1) the single combat duels; 2) the martyrdom of ‘Ubayda (via al-Ṭabarī); and 3) the poetic verse uttered by ‘Ubayda (via al-Ṭabarī). Of the two, al-Wāqidī’s version contains far more material in its elaboration of the motifs. The kind of elaboration exhibited in relation to the first two motifs may be elucidated through a couple observations. Firstly in Ibn Ishāq, the pairings and consequences of the duels are reported simply and matter-of-factly (1). In al-Wāqidī’s

<sup>407</sup> عبيدة بن الحارث. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1317.

<sup>408</sup> فقتلاه. Ibid., 1318.

<sup>409</sup> صاحبهما عبيدة. Ibid.

<sup>410</sup> فجاء به إلى. Ibid.

<sup>411</sup> Ibid.

version however, the duels are animated and progressively play out one at a time.

Secondly, the manner in which ‘Ubayda received his fatal injury is illustrated in vivid detail in al-Wāqidī (1), but the colorful episode is absent in Ibn Ishāq. In all likelihood the animation of the duels and the liveliness with which they are recounted in the version of al-Wāqidī are hallmarks of the storyteller.

If al-Wāqidī’s account is stripped of its storyteller elements, then it may appear that the two versions are one and the same, indicating al-Wāqidī’s dependence upon Ibn Ishāq. A noteworthy variant in the storyline however demonstrates that the versions at least partially do not share a common source. This variant involves the pairings of the duels (1). In Ibn Ishāq, Ḥamza is paired with Shayba, and ‘Ubayda is paired with ‘Utba. Yet in al-Wāqidī, Ḥamza is paired with ‘Utba, and ‘Ubayda is paired with Shayba. As a matter of fact, the pairings by al-Wāqidī match those in Mūsā’s version in al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il*:

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>412</sup>	Al-Wāqidī
Then the tribe of their uncle arose against them. Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib arose as well as ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith b. al-Muṭṭalib. Ḥamza faced ‘Utba, ‘Ubayda faced Shayba, and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd. Then Ḥamza slew ‘Utba, ‘Ubayda slew Shayba, and ‘Alī slew al-Walīd. Shayba struck the leg of ‘Ubayda and amputated it. Ḥamza and ‘Alī rescued him, and he was carried until he died due to the [loss of] bile.	Then ‘Utba said to his son, “Rise, O Walīd,” and al-Walīd arose. ‘Alī stood up against him, and he was the youngest of the group. ‘Alī, peace be upon him, slew him [al-Walīd]. Then ‘Utba arose, and Ḥamza stood up against him. After they exchanged blows, Ḥamza, may God be pleased with him, slew him [‘Utba]. Then Shayba arose, and ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith stood up against him—in that day he was the eldest of the Prophet’s companions—and Shayba struck ‘Ubayda’s leg with the tip of the sword. It reached the muscle of his thigh and cut it. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on Shayba and slew him. They carried ‘Ubayda and united him with the ranks. With the marrow oozing from his thigh, ‘Ubayda asked, “O messenger of God, am I not a martyr?” He replied, “Indeed you are.”
وليفع إليهم بنو عمهم، فقام حمزة بن عبد المطلب، وعلي بن أبي طالب، وعبيدة بن الحارث ابن المطلب، فبرز حمزة لعتبة، وبرز عبيدة لشيبة، وبرز علي للوليد، فقتل	ثم قال عتبة لابنه: قم يا وليد، فقام الوليد، فقام إليه علي، وكان أصغر نفر، فقتله علي عليه السلام. ثم قام عتبة، وقام إليه حمزة، فاختلفا ضربتني فقتله حمزة رضي الله

<sup>412</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113-14.

<p>حمزة عتبة، وقتل عبيدة شيبية، وقتل علي الوليد، وضرب شيبية رجل عبيدة فقطعها، فاستنقذه حمزة وعلي، فحمل حتى توفي بالصفراء.</p>	<p>عنه. ثم قام شيبية، وقام إليه عبيدة بن الحارث – وهو يومئذ أسن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – فضرب شيبية رجل عبيدة بذياب السيف، فأصاب عضلة ساقه فقطعها. وكرّ حمزة وعلي علي شيبية فقتلاه، واحتملا عبيدة فحازاه إلى الصف، ومخّ ساقه يسيل، فقال عبيدة: يا رسول الله، ألسنت شهيدا؟ قال: بلى.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thus al-Wāqidī possibly drew from Mūsā for the pairings of the duels.

### The Vision of ‘Ātika

For the analysis, the story of ‘Ātika’s vision is divided into four sections. Each section displays the variants that Jones listed in his study. His numbering of the variants has been retained, and a few other variants he left unmentioned are added. In addition to the variants, phrases and sentences that are contained identically in both versions are provided and are each assigned a number according to their location in the text and in relation to the numbered variants.

### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 1

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>413</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>414</sup>
<p>Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ‘Ikrima from Ibn ‘Abbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and they both said: Three days before Ḍamḍam arrived in Mecca, ‘Ātika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and she said, “O my brother, by God last night I saw a vision which frightened me and I am afraid that evil and misfortune will come upon your people, so keep what I tell you to yourself.” He asked, “What did you see?” She replied, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel. He halted in the valley and shouted at the top of his voice, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ I saw the people gather around him; then</p>	<p>They said: ‘Ātika d. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, before [the arrival of] Ḍamḍam b. ‘Amr, saw a vision which frightened her and caused agony in her heart. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās, and she said, “O my brother, by God last night I saw a vision of which I was frightened. I am afraid that evil and misfortune will come upon your people, so keep what I tell you to yourself.” She said, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel until he halted in the valley. Then he shouted at the top of his voice, ‘O people of treachery, come forth to your destruction in three days’ time!’ He shouted it three times. I saw the people gather around him; then he went into the mosque with the people following him. When his camel mounted to the top of the Ka’ba, he shouted the</p>

<sup>413</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-8.

<sup>414</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:29.

<p>he went into the mosque with the people following him. While they were around him, his camel mounted to the top of the Ka'ba. Then he shouted the same words, 'Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days' time.' Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays, and he shouted the same thing. Then he took hold of a boulder, released it, and it began to fall. At the bottom of the mountain it shattered into pieces. There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling in Mecca that a piece did not enter."</p>	<p>same words three times. Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays. Then he shouted the same words three times. Then he took hold of a boulder from Abū Qubays, released it, and it began to fall. At the bottom of the mountain it shattered into pieces. There was neither a house among houses in Mecca nor a dwelling among dwellings in Mecca that a piece did not enter."</p>
<p>قال ابن إسحاق: فأخبرني من لا أتهم، عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس، ويزيد ابن رومان، عن عروة بن الزبير، قالاً: <sup>415</sup>وقد رأيت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب، قبل قدوم ضمضم مكة بثلاث ليال، رؤيا أفرعتها. فبعثت إلى أخيها العباس بن عبد المطلب، فقالت له: يا أخي، والله لقد رأيت الليلة رؤيا أفضعتني، وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة، فاكتم عني <sup>416</sup>ما أحدثك به، <sup>417</sup>فقال لها: وما رأيت؟ قالت: رأيت راكبا أقبل على بعير له، حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته: <sup>418</sup>ألا انفروا يا لغدر <sup>419</sup>لمصارعكم في ثلاث، فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه، فبينما <sup>420</sup>هم حوله، مثل به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة، ثم صرخ بمثلها: <sup>421</sup>ألا انفروا يا لغدر <sup>422</sup>لمصارعكم في ثلاث: ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس، فصرخ بمثلها. ثم أخذ صخرة فأرسلها. فأقبلت تهوى، حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارفضت، فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة، ولا دار من دور مكة، إلا دخلته منها فلذة.</p>	<p>قالوا: وقد رأيت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب قبل ضمضم بن عمرو رؤيا أفرعتها، وعظمت في صدرها. فأرسلت إلى أخيها العباس فقالت: يا أخي، قد رأيت والله رؤيا الليلة أفضعتني، وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة، فاكتم علي أحدثك منها. قالت: رأيت راكبا أقبل على بعير حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته: يا آل غدر، انفروا إلى مصارعكم في ثلاث! فصرخ بها ثلاث مرّات، فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه إذ مثل به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة، فصرخ بمثلها ثلاثا، ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس، ثم صرخ بمثلها ثلاثا. ثم أخذ صخرة من أبي قبيس فأرسلها، فأقبلت تهوى حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارفضت، فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة، ولا دار من دور مكة، إلا دخلته منها فلذة.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidi
1	قبل قدوم ضمضم مكة	قبل ضمضم بن عمرو
2	بثلاث ليال	Not present
3	أفرعتها	أفرعتها، وعظمت في صدرها
4	فبعثت	فأرسلت
5	بن عبد المطلب	Not present
6	له	Not present
7	والله لقد رأيت الليلة رؤيا أفضعتني	قد رأيت والله رؤيا الليلة أفضعتني
7a	وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة	وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شر ومصيبة
8	فاكتم عني ما أحدثك به	فاكتم علي أحدثك منها

<sup>415</sup> قال. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḥ*, 3:1292.

<sup>416</sup> Ibid., 1293.

<sup>417</sup> Ibid. أحدثك.

<sup>418</sup> Ibid. أن.

<sup>419</sup> Ibid. يال غدر.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid. فبينما.

<sup>421</sup> Ibid. ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته بمثلها أن.

<sup>422</sup> Ibid. يال غدر.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid. ولا دار من دورها إلا.

9	فقال لها: وما رايت؟	Not present
9a	رايت راكبا اقبل على بعير	رايت راكبا اقبل على بعير
10	له	Not present
10a	حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته	حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته
11	ألا انفروا يا لغدر لمصار عكم في ثلاث	يا آل عذر، انفروا إلى مصار عكم في ثلاث! فصرخ بها ثلاث مرّات
11a	فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه	فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه
12	فبينما هم حوله مثل	إذ مثل
12a	به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة	به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة
13	ثم صرخ بمثلها	فصرخ بمثلها ثلاثا
14	ألا انفروا يا لغدر لمصار عكم في ثلاث	Not present
14a	ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس	ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس
15	فصرخ بمثلها	ثم صرخ بمثلها ثلاثا
15a	ثم أخذ صخرة	ثم أخذ صخرة
16	Not present	من أبي قبيس
16a	فأقبلت تهوى، حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارفضت	فأقبلت تهوى حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارفضت
16b	فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة	فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة
17	ولا دار	ولا دار من دور مكة
17a	إلا دخلتها منها	إلا دخلته منها
17b	فلقة	فلقة

The large number of literal parallels (7a, 9a, 10a, 11, 11a, 12a, 14a, 15, 15a, 16a, 16b, 17a) demonstrates that al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Ishāq. Most of the variants between the versions are minor in that they affect neither meaning nor the storyline. For example, al-Wāqidī's version lacks a number of phrases and sentences (2, 7, 9, 10, 14) that are present in Ibn Ishāq's version. Al-Wāqidī's version is also shorter than Ibn Ishāq's version in other locations (1, 5, 12). These differences were possibly created by al-Wāqidī whose concern may have been to summarize the narrative of Ibn Ishāq. Another difference between the versions is that they are characterized by synonyms in two instances (4, 17b). For one of the instances (4), al-Wāqidī may have drawn from Mūsā, whose version in al-Bayhaqī's *Dalā'il* reports the same verb in 'Ātika's conveyance to al-'Abbās: *arsalat*.<sup>424</sup>

A significant variant in which the storyline is affected pertains to the number of times the rider exclaimed the Meccans' destruction. In Ibn Ishāq, the destruction was exclaimed three times, or once at three separate locations. In al-Wāqidī, it was

<sup>424</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103.

exclaimed a total of nine times, or thrice at each of the three locations (11, 13, 15). This escalation from three to nine is noted by Jones as a feature of the *qāṣṣ* who was skilled in dramatization, and in this case, the climactic building up of a dramatic situation.<sup>425</sup>

Whereas Jones maintained that al-Wāqidī drew the rider's exclamations from the *qiṣṣa* of his own time, the present analysis finds that al-Wāqidī possibly drew them from Mūsā. For in the work ascribed to Mūsā, the number of exclamations in two of the three locations is multiplied by three as is indicated by the word *thalātha*.<sup>426</sup> It seems that al-Wāqidī for his embellished version inserted the word *thalātha* in the third of the three locations, resulting in a total of nine exclamations:

Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>427</sup>	Al-Wāqidī
<p>She [ʿĀtika] said, “I saw a rider approaching from the top of Mecca on his camel shouting at the top of his voice, ‘O people of treachery, leave in two or three nights.’ He drew near shouting and entered the mosque on his camel. When he had shouted three times, men, women and children inclined towards him, and they were greatly alarmed.” She continued, “Then I saw him do the same on top of the Kaʿba on his camel, and he shouted three times, ‘O people of treachery, O people of immorality. Leave in two or three nights.’ Then I saw him do the same on top of Abū Qubays likewise saying, ‘O people of treachery’ and ‘O people of immorality,’ until it was heard among the merchants of Mecca.”</p>	<p>She [ʿĀtika] said, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel until he halted in the valley. Then he shouted at the top of his voice, ‘O people of treachery, come forth to your destruction in three days’ time!’ He shouted it three times. I saw the people gather around him; then he went into the mosque with the people following him. When his camel mounted to the top of the Kaʿba, he shouted the same words three times. Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays. Then he shouted the same words three times.”</p>
<p>فَقَالَتْ: رَأَيْتُ رَاكِبًا أَقْبَلَ مِنْ أَعْلَى مَكَّةَ عَلَى رَاحِلَتِهِ يَصِيحُ بِأَعْلَى صَوْتِهِ: يَا آلَ غَدْرٍ أَخْرَجُوا فِي لَيْلَتَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلَاثٍ، فَأَقْبَلَ يَصِيحُ حَتَّى دَخَلَ الْمَسْجِدَ عَلَى رَاحِلَتِهِ، فَصَاحَ ثَلَاثَ صِيحَاتٍ، وَمَالَ عَلَيْهِ الرِّجَالُ وَالنِّسَاءُ وَالصَّبِيَّانَ وَفَزِعَ لَهُ النَّاسُ أَشَدَّ الْفَزَعِ، قَالَتْ: ثُمَّ أَرَاهُ مِثْلَ عَلَى ظَهْرِ الْكَعْبَةِ عَلَى رَاحِلَتِهِ فَصَاحَ ثَلَاثَ صِيحَاتٍ، فَقَالَ: يَا آلَ غَدْرٍ وَيَا آلَ فَجْرِ: أَخْرَجُوا فِي لَيْلَتَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلَاثٍ، ثُمَّ أَرَاهُ مِثْلَ عَلَى ظَهْرِ أَبِي قَبِيْسٍ، كَذَلِكَ يَقُولُ يَا آلَ غَدْرٍ وَيَا آلَ فَجْرِ، حَتَّى أَسْمَعَ مِنَ بَيْنِ الْأَخْشَبِيِّينَ مِنْ أَهْلِ مَكَّةَ.</p>	<p>قَالَتْ: رَأَيْتُ رَاكِبًا أَقْبَلَ عَلَى بَعِيرٍ حَتَّى وَقَفَ بِالْأَبْطَحِ، ثُمَّ صَرَخَ بِأَعْلَى صَوْتِهِ: يَا آلَ غَدْرٍ، انْفِرُوا إِلَى مِصَارِعِكُمْ فِي ثَلَاثٍ! فَصَرَخَ بِهَا ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ، فَأَرَى النَّاسَ اجْتَمَعُوا إِلَيْهِ، ثُمَّ دَخَلَ الْمَسْجِدَ وَالنَّاسَ يَتَّبِعُونَهُ إِذْ مِثْلَ بِهِ بَعِيرِهِ عَلَى ظَهْرِ الْكَعْبَةِ، فَصَرَخَ بِمِثْلِهَا ثَلَاثًا، ثُمَّ مِثْلَ بِهِ بَعِيرِهِ عَلَى رَأْسِ أَبِي قَبِيْسٍ، ثُمَّ صَرَخَ بِمِثْلِهَا ثَلَاثًا.</p>

<sup>425</sup> Jones, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī,” 46.

<sup>426</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103.

<sup>427</sup> *Ibid.*

A variant that may show that al-Wāqidī either invented material or drew from other than Ibn Ishāq pertains to the effect that ‘Ātika’s vision had upon her. In the text of Ibn Ishāq in which the phrase is absent (3), there was only one effect of the vision upon ‘Ātika: it frightened her. In al-Wāqidī however, not only did ‘Ātika’s vision frighten her, but it also caused agony in her heart. This additional phrase in al-Wāqidī also finds no correlation in Mūsā’s version in al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il*.

#### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 2

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>428</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>429</sup>
<p>Al-‘Abbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-‘Abbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ‘Utba, and the story spread in Mecca until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings.</p> <p>Al-‘Abbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ‘Ātika’s vision. When Abū Jahl saw me he said, “O Abū al-Faḍl, when you have finished your circumambulation, come over to us.” When I finished, I went and sat with them, and Abū Jahl asked, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “That vision which ‘Ātika saw.” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: Then I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?! ‘Ātika claimed in her vision that someone said, ‘Come forth in three days’ time.’ We will wait these three days. If what she says is true, then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing</p>	<p>They said: Her brother said, “This is indeed a vision!” He went out distressed and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But the story spread among the people.</p> <p>He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and there was Abū Jahl sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ‘Ātika’s vision. Abū Jahl said, “What ‘Ātika saw was this!” I asked, “What is that?” He said, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy? ‘Ātika claimed that she saw in the vision such and such—that which she had seen—so we will wait three days. If what she said is true then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka‘ba among the Arabs.”</p> <p>He [Al-‘Abbās] replied, “O cowardly wretch. You are the first of liars and wickedness among us.” Abū Jahl responded, “We vied for the honor, for you said, ‘Ours is the distribution of water.’ And we said, ‘We don’t mind. You draw water for the <i>ḥajj</i>!’ Then you said, ‘We hold the office of the gatekeeper,’ and we said, ‘We don’t mind. You protect</p>

<sup>428</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-9.

<sup>429</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:29-30.

happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka'ba among the Arabs.”

the Ka'ba! Then you said, 'Ours is the council!' and we said, 'We don't mind. You prepare the food and feed the people.' Then you said, 'Ours is the support,' and we said, 'We don't mind. You gather what is needed for the weak! When we fed the people, then you fed them. The travelers gathered, and we vied for the honor, for we were like two race horses. You said, 'A prophet is from us!' Then you said, 'A prophetess is from us.' No by Allāt and al-'Uzzā, this was never to happen.”

قال العباس: والله إن هذه لرؤيا، وأنت فاكتميتها، ولا تذكرها لأحد. ثم خرج العباس فلقى الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة، وكان له صديقا، فذكرها له، واستكتمه إياه، فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة، ففشا الحديث بمكة،<sup>430</sup> حتى تحدّث به قريش في أنديةها.<sup>431</sup>

قال العباس: فغدوت لأطوف<sup>432</sup> بالبيت وأبو جهل بن هشام في رهط من قريش فعود، يتحدثون برؤيا عاتكة، فلما رأني أبو جهل قال: يا أبا الفضل، إذا فرغت من طوافك فأقبل إلينا، فلما<sup>433</sup> فرغت أقبلت،<sup>434</sup> حتى جلست معهم، فقال لي أبو جهل: يا بني عبد المطلب: متى حدثت فيكم هذه النبوة؟ قال: قلت: وما ذلك؟ قال: تلك رؤيا<sup>435</sup> التي رأيت عاتكة، قال: فقلت: <sup>436</sup> وما رأيت؟ قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن يتنبأ رجالكم حتى تتنبأ نساؤكم؟! قد زعمت عاتكة في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث، فسنتريص بكم هذه الثلاث، فإن يك حقا ما تقول فسيكون،<sup>437</sup> وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء، نكتب عليكم كتابا أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.

قالوا: فقال أخوها: إن هذه لرؤيا! فخرج مغتما حتى لقي الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة، وكان له صديقا، فذكرها له واستكتمه، ففشا الحديث في الناس.

قال: فغدوت أطوف بالبيت، وأبو جهل في رهط من قريش يتحدثون قعودا برؤيا عاتكة. فقال ابن جهل: ما رأيت عاتكة هذه! فقلت: وما ذلك؟ فقال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن يتنبأ رجالكم حتى تتنبأ نساؤكم؟ زعمت عاتكة أنها رأيت في المنام كذا وكذا – الذي رأيت – فسنتريص بكم ثلاثا، فإن يك ما قالت حقا فسيكون، وإن مضت الثلاث ولم يكن نكتب عليكم أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.

فقال: يا مصفر استه، أنت أولى بالكذب واللؤم منا! قال أبو جهل: إنا استبقنا المجد وأنتم فقلتم: فينا السفاية! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تسقون الحاج! ثم قلتم: فينا الحجابة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تحجبون البيت! ثم قلتم: فينا الندوة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تلون الطعام وتطمعون الناس، ثم قلتم: فينا الرفادة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تجمعون عندكم ما ترفدون به الضعيف! فلما أطعمنا الناس وأطعمتم، وازدحمت الركب، واستبقنا المجد، فكنا كفرسي رهان، قلتم: منا نبئي! ثم قلتم: منا نبية! فلا واللات والعزى، لا كان هذا أبدا!

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidi
18	قال العباس: والله إن هذه لرؤيا	فقال أخوها: إن هذه لرؤيا
19	وأنت فاكتميتها، ولا تذكرها لأحد	Not present
20	ثم خرج العباس فلقى	فخرج مغتما حتى لقي
21	إياه	Not present
21a	Not present	له
22	فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة	Not present
23	بمكة	في الناس

<sup>430</sup> فشا الحديث Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1293.

<sup>431</sup> قريش. Ibid.

<sup>432</sup> أطوف. Ibid.

<sup>433</sup> قال فلما. Ibid.

<sup>434</sup> أقبلت إليه. Ibid.

<sup>435</sup> الرؤيا. Ibid., 1294.

<sup>436</sup> قلت. Ibid.

<sup>437</sup> Ibid. فإن يكن ما قالت حقا فسيكون.

24	حتى تحدث به فريش في أنديةها.	Not present
25	قال العباس	قال
25a	فغدوت	فغدوت
26	لأطوف (أطوف (via al-Ṭabarī—	أطوف
26a	بالبيت	بالبيت
27	وأبو جهل بن هشام	وأبو جهل
27a	في رهط من فريش	في رهط من فريش
28	يحدثون، يتحدثون	يتحدثون يحدوثا
28a	برؤيا عاتكة	برؤيا عاتكة
28b	فلما رأني أبو جهل قال: يا أبا الفضل، إذا فرغت من طوافك فأقبل إلينا، فلما فرغت أقبلت، حتى جلست معهم	Not present
29	فقال لي أبو جهل: يا بني عبد المطلب: متى حدثت فيكم هذه النبوة؟ قال: قلت: وما ذلك؟ قال: تلك رؤيا التي رأيت عاتكة، قال: فقلت: وما رأيت	فقال أبو جهل: ما رأيت عاتكة هذه! فقلت: وما ذلك
29a	قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن ينتبأ رجالكم حتى تنتبأ نساؤكم	فقال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن ينتبأ رجالكم حتى تنتبأ نساؤكم
30	قد	Not present
30a	زعمت عاتكة	زعمت عاتكة
31	في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث	أنها رأيت في المنام كذا وكذا – الذي رأيت
31a	فستريص بكم	فستريص بكم
32	هذه الثلاث	ثلاثا
33	حقًا ما تقول (ما قالت حقًا (via al-Ṭabarī—	ما قالت حقًا
33a	فسيكون	فسيكون
34	وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء	وإن مضت الثلاث ولم يكن
35	نكتب عليكم كتابا	نكتب عليكم
35a	أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب	أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب
35b	Not present	فقال: يا مصفر استه، أنت أولى بالكذب واللؤم منا! قال أبو جهل: إنا استبقنا المجد وأنتم فقلتم: فينا السقاية! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تسقون الحاج! ثم قلتم: فينا الحجابة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تحجبون البيت! ثم قلتم: فينا الندوة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تلون الطعام وتطعمون الناس، ثم قلتم: فينا الرفادة! فقلنا: لا نبالي، تجمعون عندكم ما ترفدون به الضعيف! فلما أطعمنا الناس وأطعمتم، وازدحمت الركب، واستبقنا المجد، فكنا كفرسي رهان، قلتم: منا نبي! ثم قلتم: منا نبيّة! فلا واللات والعزى، لا كان هذا أبدا!

That the two versions are identical in many locations (18, 25a, 26 [via al-Ṭabarī], 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a, 30a, 31a, 33 [via al-Ṭabarī], 33a, 35a) demonstrates that al-Wāqidī is dependent upon Ibn Ishāq. In most of the other locations, the version of al-Wāqidī is parallel to and reads much like a summary of Ibn Ishāq's version. It is possible that al-Wāqidī omitted phrases and sentences (21, 22, 24, 28b, 29) from the text of Ibn Ishāq,

and in other areas, made shortenings (20, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35). He also may have altered the word order in one location (28). As for the extra report in al-Wāqidī (35b), it is characterized by pro-ʿAbbāsīd bias.

### The Vision of ʿĀtika—Section 3

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>438</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>439</sup>
<p>Al-ʿAbbās said: By God, it was no great issue between us except that I contradicted that and denied that she had seen anything. Then we separated. When night came, there was not a woman from Banū al-Muṭṭalib who did not come to me. Each of them said, “Have you allowed this evil rascal [Abū Jahl] to attack your men and then go on with your women while you listened? Then you did not retaliate given what you heard?” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I said, “By God I have done so. It was no great issue between us, but I swear to God that I will confront him, and if he repeats what he said, then I will rid you of him.”</p>	<p>He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: By God, I took no issue with it except that I contradicted that and denied that ʿĀtika had seen anything. When night came, there was not a woman born of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib who did not come, and they said, “You were content with this evil rascal to attack your men and then to go on with your women while you listened. And it was of no concern to you?” He said, “By God I did not do what the situation required. By God I will confront him tomorrow, and if he repeats what he said, then I will rid you of him.”</p> <p>When it was morning on that day which ʿĀtika saw in her vision, Abū Jahl said, “That’s one day!” Then tomorrow Abū Jahl said, “That’s two days!” When it was the third day, Abū Jahl said, “That’s three days. There are none left.”</p>
<p>قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إليه كبير، إلا أني جحدت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون رأيت شيئاً. قال: ثم تفرقنا. فلما أمسيت، لم تبق امرأة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أتتني، فقالت: أفررت لهذا الفاسق الخبيث أن يقع في رجالكم، ثم قد تناول النساء وأنت تسمع، ثم لم يكن عندك غير لشيء مما سمعت، قال: قلت: قد والله فعلت، ما كان مني إليه من كبير. وأيم الله لأتعرضن له، فإن عاد لأكفينكته.<sup>440</sup></p>	<p>قال: فوالله، ما كان مني من غير إلا أني جحدت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون عاتكة رأيت شيئاً. فلما أمسيت لم تبق امرأة أصابتها ولادة عبد المطلب إلا جاءت، فقلن: رضيت بهذا الفاسق الخبيث يقع في رجالكم، ثم قد تناول نساءكم وأنت تسمع، ولم يكن لك عند ذلك غيره؟ قال: والله ما فعلت إلا ما لا بال به. والله لأتعرضن له غداً، فإن عاد لأكفيكموه.</p> <p>فلما أصبحوا من ذلك اليوم الذي رأيت فيه عاتكة من رأيت قال أبو جهل: هذا يوم! ثم الغد قال أبو جهل: هذان يومان! فلما كان في اليوم الثالث، قال أبو جهل: هذه ثلاثة أيام، ما بقي.</p>

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
36	قال العباس	قال
36a	فوالله ما كان	فوالله ما كان
37	مني إليه كبير، إلا أني	من غير إلا أني
38	أن تكون	أن تكون عاتكة

<sup>438</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:609.

<sup>439</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:30.

<sup>440</sup> لأكفينكموه. Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3:1294.

39	قال: ثم تفرقنا	Not present
39a	فلما أمسيت، لم تبق امرأة	فلما أمسيت لم تبق امرأة
40	من بني عبد المطلب إلا أتتني، فقالت: أقررتم لهذا الفاسق الخبيث أن يقع في رجالكم	أصابته ولادة عبد المطلب إلا جاءت، فقلن: رضيتم بهذا الفاسق الخبيث يقع في رجالكم
40a	ثم قد تناول	ثم قد تناول
41	النساء	نساءكم
41a	وانت تسمع	وانت تسمع
42	ثم لم يكن عندك غير لشيء مما سمعت	ولم يكن لك عند ذلك غيره
43	قال: قلت: قد والله فعلت، ما كان مني إليه من كبير وأيم الله لأتعرضن له، فإن عاد لأكفيكته	قال: والله ما فعلت إلا ما لا بال به، والله لأعترضن له غدا فإن عاد لأكفيكموه
44	Not present	فلما أصبحوا من ذلك اليوم الذي رأت فيه عاتكة من رأت قال أبو جهل: هذا يوم! ثم الغد قال أبو جهل: هذان يومان! فلما كان في اليوم الثالث، قال أبو جهل: هذه ثلاثة أيام، ما بقي.

For the passage in which al-‘Abbās vowed to confront Abū Jahl, it is clear that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq. Not only is al-Wāqidī’s report parallel to the one in Ibn Ishāq, but there are also five locations in which the parallels are literal (36a, 39a, 40a, 41a, 44a). Moreover, it is possible that al-Wāqidī shortened the narrative of Ibn Ishāq in several locations (36, 39, 41, 42, 43).

The extra material in al-Wāqidī (44), which comes after al-‘Abbās’s vow to confront Abū Jahl, is a separate report that was either drawn from a source other than Ibn Ishāq or invented by al-Wāqidī. The report, which exhibits characteristics such as repetition and an emphasis on number, was already identified by Jones as belonging to the *qāṣṣ*.<sup>441</sup>

#### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 4

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>442</sup>	Al-Wāqidī <sup>443</sup>
He [Al-‘Abbās] said: On the third day after ‘Ātika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for which I wanted to get back at him. I went into the mosque and saw him. I walked towards him to confront him so that he could repeat some of what he had said so that I could attack him—he	He [Al-‘Abbās] said: On the third day after ‘Ātika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for which I wanted to get back at him, and remembering what vexed me from the women’s words. By God I walked towards him—he was a thin man with a sharp face, sharp tongue, and a

<sup>441</sup> Jones, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī,” 46.

<sup>442</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:609.

<sup>443</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:31.

was a thin man with sharp features, a sharp tongue and a sharp glance. He [Al-'Abbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-'Abbās] said: I said to myself, "What is the matter with him? God curse him. Is all this out of fear that I will revile him?" He [Al-'Abbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of Ḍamḍam b. 'Amr al-Ghifārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel's nose, turned his saddle around, and torn his shirt, and he was saying, "O people of Quraysh, the caravan, the caravan! Your wealth is with Abū Sufyān, and Muḥammad and his companions have set out to intercept it. I do not think that you will reach it. Help! Help!" This diverted me from him, and he was diverted from me in our affair.

sharp glance. Suddenly he went towards the door of Banū Sahm hurriedly. I said, "What is it with him? God curse him. Is all this out of fear that I will revile him?" However he had heard the voice of Ḍamḍam b. 'Amr, who was saying, "O people of Quraysh, O people of Lu'ayy b. Ghālib, the caravan! Muḥammad and his companions have set out to intercept it. Help! Help! By God I do not think that you will reach it." Ḍamḍam was shouting that in the bottom of the valley. He had cut off his camel's nose, torn his shirt from front to back, and turned his saddle around. He used to say, "I beheld myself before I entered Mecca, for I had a dream while on my camel; it was as though the valley of Mecca was gushing blood from top to bottom. Then I woke up frightened and alarmed. I found it repugnant for Quraysh, for it came to me that it meant disaster for them."

قال: فغدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤيا عاتكة، وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى أنى قد فاتنى منه أمر أحب أن أدركه منه. قال: فدخلت المسجد فرأيت، فوالله إنى لأمشى نحوه أتعرضه، ليعود لبعض ما قال، فأقع به، وكان رجلا خفيفا، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان حديد النظر. قال: إذ<sup>444</sup> خرج نحو باب المسجد يشتد. قال: فقلت<sup>445</sup> في نفسي: ما له لعنه الله، أكل هذا فرق منى<sup>446</sup> أن أشاتمته! قال: وإذا هو قد سمع ما لم أسمع: صوت ضمضم بن عمرو الغفاري، وهو يصرخ ببطن الوادي واقفا على بعيره، قد جدع بعيره، وحول رحله، وشق قميصه، وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، اللطيمة اللطيمة، أموالكم مع أبى سفيان قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه، لا أرى أن تتركوها، الغوث الغوث. قال: فشغلني عنه، وشغله عني ما جاء من الأمر.

قال: وغدوت في اليوم الثالث وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى أن قد فاتنى منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظتني النساء به من مقاتتهن لي ما قلن، فوالله إنى لأمشى نحوه – وكان رجلا خفيفا، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان، حديد النظر – إذ خرج نحو باب بني سهم يشتد، فقلت: ما باله، لعنه الله. أكل هذا فرقا من أن أشاتمته؟ فإذا هو قد سمع صوت ضمضم ابن عمرو وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، يا آل لؤي بن غالب، اللطيمة، قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه! الغوث، الغوث! والله، ما أرى أن تتركوها! وضمضم ينادى بذلك ببطن الوادي، قد جدع أدنى بعيره، وشق قميصه قبلا ودبرا، وحول رحله. وكان يقول: لقد رأيتني قبل أن أدخل مكة وإنى لأرى في النوم، وأنا على راحلتي، كأن وادي مكة يسيل من أعلاه إلى أسفله دما، فاستيقظت فزعا مذعورا، وكرهتها لقريش، ووقع في نفسي أنها مصيبة في أنفسهم.

	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)	Al-Wāqidī
44a	غدوت في اليوم الثالث	غدوت في اليوم الثالث
45	من رؤيا عاتكة	Not present
45a	وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى	وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى
45b	أنى	أن
45c	قد فاتنى منه أمر أحب أن أدركه	قد فاتنى منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
45d	منه	Not present
45e	قال: فدخلت المسجد فرأيت	Not present
46	Not present	وأذكر ما أحفظتني النساء به من مقاتتهن لي ما قلن

<sup>444</sup> النظر إذ. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1295.

<sup>445</sup> قلت. Ibid.

<sup>446</sup> من. Ibid.

46a	فوالله إني لأمشي نحوه	فوالله إني لأمشي نحوه
47	أتعرّضه، ليعود لبعض ما قال، فأقع به	Not present
47a	وكان رجلا خفيفا، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان حديد النظر	وكان رجلا خفيفا، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان، حديد النظر
48	نحو باب المسجد يشتدّ	نحو باب بني سهم يشتدّ
49	في نفسي	Not present
50	قال: وإذا	فإذا
51	ماله	ما ياله
51a	لعنه الله، أكلّ هذا	لعنه الله. أكلّ هذا
52	فرق مني أن أشاتمته	فرقا من أن أشاتمته
53	قال	Not present
53a	هو قد سمع	هو قد سمع
53b	صوت ضمضم بن عمرو	صوت ضمضم ابن عمرو
54	الغفاريّ	Not present
55	وهو بصرخ بيطن الوادي واقفا على بعيره، قد جدّع بعيره، وحوّل رحله، وشقّ قميصه، وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، اللطيمة اللطيمة، أموالكم مع أبي سفيان قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه، لا أرى أن تدركوها، الغوث الغوث	وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، يا آل لؤي بن غالب، اللطيمة، قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه! الغوث، الغوث! والله، ما أرى أن تدركوها! وضمضم ينادى بذلك بيطن الوادي، قد جدّع أذني بعيره، وشقّ قميصه قبلا ودبرا، وحوّل رحله
55a	قال: فشغلني عنه، وشغله عني ما جاء من الأمر.	Not present
55b	Not present	وكان يقول: لقد رأيتني قبل أن أدخل مكة وإني لأرى في النوم، وأنا على راحلتي، كأن وادي مكّة يسيل من أعلاه إلى أسفله دما، فاستيقظت فزعا مذعورا، وكرهتها لقريش، ووقع في نفسي أنها مصيبة في أنفسهم.

The large number of literal parallels (44a, 45a, 45c, 46a, 47a, 51a, 53a, 53b) shows that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq. With regard to some of the differences, al-Wāqidī may have shortened the narrative of Ibn Ishāq (45, 45d, 45e, 47, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 55a), altered the word order in one location (55), and inserted explanatory material in another location (46).

In one instance (48), al-Wāqidī appears to have been concerned to add “knowledge” to the narrative, and in another instance (55), he may have drawn a detail from Mūsā, whose version in al-Bayhaqī’s *Dalā’il* has the people of Ghālib b. Fihir as Ḍamḍam’s addressee.<sup>447</sup> The extra report (55b) in al-Wāqidī seems to have been drawn from other than Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā (A parallel report in another source was unable to be found).

<sup>447</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:104.

## Conclusion

Al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq without citing him for at least some of the council story. Not only do the two versions maintain the same content and chronology, but they also share a considerable amount of parallels, some of which are literal. In one instance, al-Wāqidī may have also drawn from Mūsā. Moreover al-Wāqidī's account in one location may exhibit Shī'ite theology.

For the single combat story, al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Ishāq for part of the story. Also al-Wāqidī possibly drew two elements of the story—1) Muḥammad's unwillingness that the Anṣār duel; and 2) the pairings of the duels—from Mūsā. Moreover the narrative in al-Wāqidī exhibits marks of the storyteller, and twice al-Wāqidī displayed a concern to enhance the single combat story. In the first instance, he clarified an ambiguity concerning the identities of those present at the duels. In the second instance, al-Wāqidī inserted a tradition that includes elucidatory information regarding a certain appellation.

Al-Wāqidī certainly drew from without citing Ibn Ishāq for the story of 'Ātika's vision. The considerable amount of literal parallels between the versions attests to this dependence. This is contrary to Jones whose consideration of the variants alone led him to argue for the independence of al-Wāqidī from Ibn Ishāq. Now having taken into account the numerous locations in which the two versions are identical, it is made plain that al-Wāqidī drew from his predecessor in the creation of his version of 'Ātika's vision. He also seems to have drawn from Mūsā in some instances. Furthermore, al-Wāqidī may have performed edits to the narrative of Ibn Ishāq, mostly in the form of omissions and shortenings. In essence, al-Wāqidī's narrative reads much like a summary of Ibn Ishāq's narrative. At the same time however, al-Wāqidī's version of 'Ātika's vision contains entire reports that are not found in Ibn Ishāq and is thus the

lengthier of the two. Finally, al-Wāqidī's narrative exhibits pro-'Abbāsīd bias and marks of the *qāṣṣ*.

## CHAPTER 3

## MŪSĀ B. ‘UQBA AND DIFFERENTIATION

The analysis of the material ascribed to Mūsā b. ‘Uqba [the Mūsā-version, or Mūsā-v] involves a comparison with the material of Ibn Ishāq and is in two parts. The first part is an examination of the three Badr stories that have been selected for the study. Each of the stories is displayed in sections in which the texts are followed by a discussion of the findings. For the material of Ibn Ishāq, the recension of Ibn Hishām is supplied, and the variants of the Ibn Ishāq-material from the recension of al-Ṭabarī are footnoted.

The recension of Ibn Hishām is also supplied for the second part of the analysis, and the variants from al-Ṭabarī’s recension are footnoted in the event that they report variations of the storyline.<sup>448</sup> In the second part, which involves the remainder of the Badr story, the findings are provided in accompaniment with their relevant texts. In some instances, comparisons with traditions in other works supplement the findings.

## Part 1

## The Council of War—Section 1

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>449</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>450</sup>
<p>Then the Prophet set out without learning of the news [concerning Abū Sufyān] and without knowing about the troop of Quraysh. And so the Prophet requested of his Companions, “Advise us in our matter and journey.”</p> <p>Abū Bakr responded, “O messenger of God, the people are acquainted with the distance of the land. ‘Adī b. Abī al-Zighbā’ informed us that the caravan was</p>	<p>News came to him [Muḥammad] about Quraysh’s advance to protect their caravan. He consulted the people and told them about Quraysh. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq arose and spoke well. Then ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.</p>

<sup>448</sup> The analysis concerns only those reports which are contained in both the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī.

<sup>449</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:106-7.

<sup>450</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614-15.

<p>in such and such valley.” Ibn Fulayḥ said in his <i>riwāya</i>: We were like two horses racing to Badr. Then we came to terms. He [Mūsā] said: Then he [Muḥammad] said, “Advise me.” ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb replied, “O messenger of God, it is Quraysh and their power; by God they are not humble since they are powerful, and they are not protected since they are disbelievers. By God they will surely fight you. Get ready therefore, and make preparations.”</p>	
<p>ثم سار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لا يلقاه خبر ولا يعلم بنفرة قريش فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لأصحابه: أشيروا علينا في أمرنا ومسيرنا. فقال أبو بكر: يا رسول الله إنا أعلم الناس بمسافة الأرض: أخبرنا عدي بن أبي الزغباء أن العير كانب بوادي كذا وكذا قال ابن فليح في روايته: فكأننا وإياهم فرسا رهان إلى بدر ثم اتفقا قال ثم قال أشيروا عليّ. فقال عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه يا رسول الله إنها قريش وعزها والله ما دلت منذ عزت ولا أمنت منذ كفرت، والله لتقاتلنك. فتأهب لذلك أهيته واعد له عدته.</p>	<p>وأناه الخبر عن قريش بمسيرهم ليمنعوا غيرهم، فاستشار الناس،<sup>451</sup> وأخبرهم عن قريش، فقام أبو بكر الصديق،<sup>452</sup> فقال وأحسن.<sup>453</sup> ثم قام عمر بن الخطاب، فقال وأحسن.<sup>454</sup></p>

The story’s plot differs between the two versions. While in the work ascribed to Mūsā, Muḥammad convened the council in order to locate the whereabouts of Abū Sufyān’s caravan, the council’s aim for Ibn Ishāq was to discover those willing to confront the advancing army of Quraysh.<sup>455</sup> Serving as the basis for the divergence in the story’s plot is a contradiction in the circumstance of the council. In Mūsā-v, the circumstance has the Prophet unaware that Quraysh had set out against him. Muḥammad however was cognizant of the advance according to Ibn Ishāq.

<sup>451</sup> فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1300.

<sup>452</sup> أبو بكر رضي الله عنه. Ibid.

<sup>453</sup> فقال فأحسن. Ibid.

<sup>454</sup> فقال فأحسن. Ibid.

<sup>455</sup> Abū Ayyūb also has the Prophet convene the council in order to discover those Muslims who were willing to confront the Meccan army which had set out to protect Abū Sufyān. Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya* 3:263:

The Prophet said, while we were in Medina, “I have received news that Abū Sufyān’s caravan is approaching. Do you want us to go out against this caravan? Perhaps God will give it to us as booty.” We replied, “Yes.” Then he went forth, and we went forth too. When we had travelled a day or two, he asked us, “What do you think about their army? They have been informed of your advance.” We replied, “No by God, we do not have the strength to fight the army. We came seeking the caravan.” Then he asked, “What do you think about fighting the army?” We answered the same as before. Then al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr arose and said, “In such case we will not say to you, O messenger, as Moses’ people said to him, ‘Go you and your Lord and fight. We will sit here.’”

The following replies to the Prophet by Abū Bakr and ‘Umar are recorded differently in Mūsā-v than in Ibn Ishāq. Whereas their responses are provided in detail in Mūsā-v, their abrupt mention in Ibn Ishāq lacks the content of the responses. Worthy of notice is that in Mūsā-v, Abū Bakr’s response which locates the caravan in a certain valley is fittingly relevant to the request of Muḥammad. This response was possibly excised by Ibn Ishāq seeing as it failed to cohere with his alternate storyline in which the advancing army of Quraysh was Muḥammad’s concern and the reason for summoning the council.<sup>456</sup>

#### The Council of War—Section 2

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>457</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>458</sup>
<p>The Prophet said, “Advise me.” Then al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr, one of Banū Zuhra, replied, “We will not say to you as the companions of Moses said, ‘Go you and your Lord and fight, we will sit here,’ but go you and your Lord and fight, we are with you as followers.”</p> <p>Then the Prophet said, “Advise me.” When Sa’d b. Mu’ādh saw how much the Prophet sought the advice of his companions—after they gave advice he returned to the consultation—Sa’d supposed that he meant the Anṣār out of concern that they would not overcome with him or—He [Mūsā] said:—that they would not obtain with him what he desired from his command. Thus Sa’d b. Mu’ādh responded, “Perhaps you, O messenger of God, fear that the Anṣār do not desire to give you charity and do not consider it right for them. Nevertheless, they saw to the enemy with their homes, children and women. I am speaking about the Anṣār and will answer for them, O messenger of God. Go where you desire. Take whoever you wish and leave behind whoever you wish. Take what you</p>	<p>Then al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr arose and said, “O messenger of God, proceed as God has shown you, for we are with you. By God we will not say to you as the Israelites said to Moses, ‘Go you and your Lord and fight, we will sit here,’ but go you and your Lord and fight, we will fight with you. By Him who sent you with the truth, if you were to take us to Bark al-Ghimād, we would fight resolutely with you against them until you gained it.” The Prophet replied, “Well done,” and prayed for him.</p> <p>Then the Prophet said, “Give me advice, O people,” meaning the Anṣār. This is because they are the majority of the people, and because when they had pledged allegiance to him at al-‘Aqaba, they said, “O messenger of God, we are exempt from protecting you until you reach our dwelling-places. But when you reach us, you will be under our protection. We will protect you from that which we protect our women and children.” The Prophet was afraid that the Anṣār were considering that they would not be an assistance to him except</p>

<sup>456</sup> ‘Umar’s response was also possibly excised.

<sup>457</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:107.

<sup>458</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

wish from our possessions, and give us what you wish. What you take from us is dearer to us than what you leave for us. What will you carry out as a command? For our command is your command of which to follow. By God if you set out to reach *al-Bark* from *ghimd dhī yaman*, then we will go with you.”

from what came upon him from his enemy in Medina, and that it was not their obligation to go with him against an enemy outside their territory.

When the Prophet said that, Sa'd b. Mu'adh said to him, “By God, you seem to mean us, O messenger of God.” “Yes,” he replied. Sa'd said, “We have believed in you and have accepted what you say as true, and we have testified that the message you brought is the truth. We have accordingly given you our word and covenant to listen and obey. Proceed O messenger of God as you wish, for we are with you; and by Him who sent you with the truth, if you lead us to the sea and plunge into it, we would plunge into it with you; not one man among us would stay behind. We are not unwilling for you to meet the enemy with us tomorrow. We are steadfast in war, trustworthy in battle. Perhaps God intends for you something from us, that which will gladden you, so take us along with God's blessing.”

فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ، فقال المققداد بن عمرو عديد بني زهرة: إنا لا نقول لك كما قال أصحاب موسى: اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا إنا ها هنا قاعدون، ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا إنا معكم متبعون.

فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ، فلما رأى سعد بن معاذ كثرة استشارة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أصحابه فيشرون فيرجع إلى المشورة ظن سعد أنه يستنطق الأنصار شفقاً ألا يستحونوا معه أو قال: ألا يستجلبوا معه على ما يريد من أمره، فقال سعد بن معاذ لعلك يا رسول الله تخشى أن لا تكون الأنصار يريدون مواساتك ولا يرونها حقاً عليهم إلا بأن يروا عدواً في بيوتهم وأولادهم ونسائهم. وإني أقول عن الأنصار وأجيب عنهم يا رسول الله، فأظعن حيث شئت وصل جبل من شئت، واقطع جبل من شئت، وخذ من أموالنا ما شئت، وأعطنا ما شئت، وما أخذته منا أحب إلينا مما تركت علينا، وما أنتمرت من أمر فأمرنا لأمرك فيه تبع، فوالله لو سرت حتى تبلغ البرك من غمد ذي يمن لسرنا معك.

ثم قام المققداد بن عمرو، فقال: يا رسول الله، امض لما أراك<sup>459</sup> الله، فحن معك، والله لا نقول لك كما قالت بنو إسرائيل لموسى: اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا ههنا قاعدون. ولكن اذهب أنت وربك فقاتلا، إنا معكم مقاتلون، فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو سرت بنا إلى برك الغماد<sup>460</sup> لجالدنا معك من دونه، حتى تبلغه، فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خيراً، ودعا له به.<sup>461</sup> ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: أشيروا عليّ أيها الناس. وإنما يريد الأنصار، وذلك أنهم عدد الناس،<sup>462</sup> وأنهم حين يابعوه بالعقبة، قالوا: يا رسول الله: إنا برآء من ذمامك، حتى تصل إلى ديارنا،<sup>463</sup> فإذا وصلت إلينا، فانت في ذمتنا،<sup>464</sup> نمنعك مما نمنع منه أبناءنا ونساءنا. فكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، يتخوف ألا تكون الأنصار ترى عليها نصره<sup>465</sup> إلا ممن دمه بالمدينة من عدوه، وأن ليس عليهم أن يسير بهم إلى عدو من بلادهم.

فلما قال ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال له سعد بن معاذ: والله لكأنك تريدنا يا رسول الله، قال: أجل. قال: فقد آمننا بك وصدقناك، وشهدنا أن ما

<sup>459</sup> أمرك. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1300.

<sup>460</sup> برك الغماد يعنى مدينة الحبشة. Ibid.

<sup>461</sup> دعا له بخير. Ibid.

<sup>462</sup> كانوا عدد الناس. Ibid., 1301.

<sup>463</sup> دارنا. Ibid.

<sup>464</sup> ذمامنا. Ibid.

<sup>465</sup> أن لا. Ibid.

<sup>466</sup> نصرته. Ibid.

	<p>جئت به هو الحق، واعطيناك على ذلك عهدنا ومواثيقنا، على السمع والطاعة، فامض يا رسول الله لما أردت، فنحن معك،<sup>467</sup> فوالذي بعثك بالحق، لو<sup>468</sup> استعرضت بنا هذا البحر فخضته، لخضناه معك، ما تخلف منا رجل واحد، وما نكره أن تلقى بنا عدونا غدا، إنا لصبر في<sup>469</sup> الحرب، صدق في<sup>470</sup> اللقاء. لعل الله يريك منا ما تقرّ به عينك، فسر بنا على بركة الله.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The speeches by al-Miqdād and Sa'd b. Mu'adh are pledges of allegiance to the Prophet.<sup>471</sup> The referent of the speeches however is not the same. In Mūsā-v, al-Miqdād and Sa'd have in mind Abū Sufyān's caravan; in Ibn Ishāq on the other hand, the army of Quraysh is in view.

In addition, a mix-up concerning the commitment to accompany the Prophet as far as Yemen is present. Whereas the commitment is placed on the lips of Sa'd in Mūsā-v, it is attributed to al-Miqdād in Ibn Ishāq's version. Possibly the commitment was attached to either figure out of tendentiousness in order to elevate his status as a devoted and heroic follower of Muḥammad.

Notably al-Miqdād's advice includes an allusion to Sūrat al-Mā'ida (5:24): "They said: 'Moses, we will never enter it so long as they are in it. Go forth, you and your Lord, and do battle; we will be sitting here.'" Uri Rubin points out that the verse was interpolated into al-Miqdād's advice in order to contrast the Arabs with the Israelites: "[A]l-Miqdād, changes the Israelite refusal of Q 5:24 ("... We will be sitting here"), and turns it into a positive Islamic version ("... We will be fighting with you")."<sup>472</sup> Rubin assesses that the purpose behind the interpolation was to promote a sacred history for the Arab believers by renewing an ancient command of God that had been enjoined upon the Israelites.

<sup>467</sup> أردت. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1302.

<sup>468</sup> إن. Ibid.

<sup>469</sup> عند. Ibid.

<sup>470</sup> عند. Ibid.

<sup>471</sup> However the pledge is attached to Sa'd b. 'Ubāda in the version of Ma'mar. 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Al-Muṣannaf*, 5:348-52, no. 9727. Of Sa'd b. 'Ubāda and Sa'd b. Mu'adh, Rubin says, "[T]hese two persons were known as al-Sa'dān (the two Sa'ds), which means that their names were interchangeable." Rubin, "Life of Muḥammad," 14.

<sup>472</sup> Rubin, "Life of Muḥammad," 8.

## The Council of War—Section 3

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>473</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>474</sup>
When Sa’d said that, the Prophet asserted, “March in the name of God Mighty and Majestic, for I was shown the places of slaughter of the people.” And he set out to Badr.	The Prophet was gladdened by Sa’d’s reply, and it strengthened him. Then he said, “March, and rejoice, for God Most High has promised me one of the two parties, and by God it is as though I now see the places of slaughter of the people.”
فلما قال ذلك سعد قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: سيروا على اسم الله عز وجل فإني قد أريت مصارع القوم فعمد لبدر.	فسرّ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقول سعد، ونشطه ذلك، ثم قال: سيروا <sup>475</sup> وأبشروا، فإن الله تعالى <sup>476</sup> قد وعدني إحدى الطائفتين، والله لكأني الآن أنظر إلى مصارع القوم.

This final report within the council narrative is a prognostication by the Prophet of the Muslim victory at the Battle of Badr. At this point of the story, the target of the Prophet in Mūsā-v changes from the caravan to the army of Quraysh.

The report in Ibn Ishāq includes a Qur’ānic reference: “God has promised me one of the two parties.” The council story as a result functions as *asbāb al-nuzūl* for Q. 8:7.<sup>477</sup> This Qur’ānic reference seems to have been an addition by Ibn Ishāq, for his version’s storyline all along had one referent as the council’s concern: the army of Quraysh. With the addition, his altered storyline included another referent: Abū Sufyān’s caravan. Thus Ibn Ishāq made available these two referents in order to connect them to the “two parties” of Q. 8:7.

## Single Combat—Section 1

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>478</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>479</sup>
Then al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī advanced swearing by his god to surely drink from the cistern that Muḥammad had built and to demolish it. He charged, and when he approached the	Al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī, who was a malicious, ill-natured man, stepped forth and said, “I swear to God that I will surely drink from their cistern, or destroy it, or die without

<sup>473</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:107.

<sup>474</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:615.

<sup>475</sup> سيروا على بركة الله. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1302.

<sup>476</sup> الله. Ibid.

<sup>477</sup> In contrast, the council story in Mūsā-v does not function as *asbāb al-nuzūl* for Q. 8:7.

<sup>478</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113.

<sup>479</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:624-25.

<p>cistern, Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib met him and struck his leg, amputating it. Then he drew near crawling until he stopped in the middle of the cistern and destroyed some of it. Ḥamza followed him and slew him.</p>	<p>doing so.” When he came forth, Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib came forth to him. When the two met, Ḥamza struck him and cut off his foot and half his leg before he reached the cistern. Al-Aswad fell on his back with blood from his leg gushing towards his companions. Then he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it, intending to fulfill his oath, but Ḥamza followed him and struck him and killed him in the cistern.</p>
<p>ثم أقبل الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي يحلف بالهته ليشربن من الحوض الذي صنع محمد وليهدمته فشد فلما دنا من الحوض لقيه حمزة بن عبد المطلب فضرب رجله فقطعها، فأقبل يحبو حتى وقع في جوف الحوض فهدم منه واتبعه حمزة حتى قتله.</p>	<p>وقد خرج الأسود بن عبد الأسد المخزومي، وكان رجلاً شرساً سيء الخلق، فقال: أعاهد الله لأشربن من حوضهم، أو لأهدمته،<sup>480</sup> أو لأموتنّ دونه، فلما خرج، خرج إليه<sup>481</sup> حمزة بن عبد المطلب، فلما التقيا ضربه حمزة فأطنّ قدمه بنصف ساقه، وهو دون الحوض، فوقع على ظهره تشخب رجله دما نحو أصحابه، ثم حبا إلى الحوض، حتى اقتحم فيه، يريد أن يبرّ يمينه، وأتبعه حمزة فضربه، حتى قتله في الحوض.</p>

Compared with the simple and straightforward narrative of Mūsā-v, the narrative of Ibn Ishāq is complex and animated, comprising of vivid details and various embellishments. In Ibn Ishāq, al-Aswad is colorfully depicted as a malicious and ill-natured man, and his manner of death is dramatically described one step at a time: 1) his foot and half his leg were amputated; 2) he fell on his back with blood gushing from his leg towards his companions; 3) he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it; and 4) finally he was followed, struck and killed by Ḥamza in the cistern. Such graphic and explicit narrations are characteristic of the *qāṣṣ*.

Also worthy of notice is the more elevated characterization of the religion of Islam in Ibn Ishāq’s account. In the scene in which the pagan al-Aswad swore by his god to destroy the cistern, his failure to fulfill his oath—due to his interception and killing by Ḥamza—in effect downplays the opposing, idolatrous religion. In Mūsā-v however, al-Aswad is partially successful.

<sup>480</sup> ولاهدمته. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1316.

<sup>481</sup> له. Ibid.

<sup>482</sup> زعم أن. Ibid., 1317.

## Single Combat—Section 2

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>483</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>484</sup>
<p>When al-Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Asad was killed, ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a descended from his camel, fervent from what Abū Jahl had said to him. Then he called out, “Who is for single combat? By God, we will let Abū Jahl know who is a coward and a pain.” Then his brother Shayba and father al-Walīd descended and called out, issuing the challenge for single combat. Three of the Anṣār arose against them. The Prophet was ashamed about that because the God-fearing were the first to fight between the Muslims and the polytheists. The Prophet was present with them, and he wanted the valor to go to the sons of his uncle. The Prophet called for them to return to their ranks. Then the sons of their uncle arose against them. Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib arose as well as ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith b. al-Muṭṭalib. Ḥamza faced ‘Utba, ‘Ubayda faced Shayba, and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd. Then Ḥamza slew ‘Utba, ‘Ubayda slew Shayba, and ‘Alī slew al-Walīd. Shayba struck the leg of ‘Ubayda and amputated it. Ḥamza and ‘Alī rescued him, and he was carried until he died due to the [loss of] bile.</p>	<p>Then after him ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a stepped forth between his brother Shayba and his son al-Walīd b. ‘Utba, and when he stood clear of the ranks gave the challenge for single combat. Three men of the Anṣār came out against him, and they were ‘Awf and Mu‘awwidh, the sons of al-Ḥārith—their mother was ‘Afrā— and another man; he is said to have been ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa.</p> <p>Then they [Quraysh] asked, “Who are you?” And they answered, “Some of the Anṣār.” They [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”</p> <p>Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥārith, and arise, O Ḥamza, and arise, O ‘Alī.” And when they arose and approached them, Quraysh asked, “Who are you?” ‘Ubayda replied, “‘Ubayda,” Ḥamza replied, “Ḥamza,” and ‘Alī replied, “‘Alī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.”</p> <p>‘Ubayda was the eldest of them, and he faced ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, while Ḥamza faced Shayba b. Rabī‘a and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd b. ‘Utba. As for Ḥamza, it was not long before he slew Shayba, and as for ‘Alī, it was not long before he slew al-Walīd. ‘Ubayda and ‘Utba exchanged blows and each maimed his opponent. Then Ḥamza and ‘Alī turned on ‘Utba with their swords and dispatched him. They [Ḥamza and ‘Alī] carried their companion [‘Ubayda] and united him with his friends.</p>
<p>فلما قتل الأسود بن عبد الأسد نزل عتبة بن ربيعة عن جملة حمية لما قال له أبو جهل، ثم نادى هل من مبارز؟ فوالله ليعلمن أبو جهل أينا أجبن والأم، ولحقه أخوه شيبه، والوليد ابنه، فناديا يسألان المبارزة، فقال إليهم ثلاثة من الأنصار فاستحى النبي صلى الله</p>	<p>ثم خرج بعده عتبة بن ربيعة، بين أخيه شيبه بن ربيعة وابنه الوليد بن عتبة، حتى إذا فصل من الصف، دعا إلى المبارزة، فخرج إليه فتية من الأنصار ثلاثة، وهم: عوف، ومعوذ، ابنا الحارث – و أمهما عفران – ورجل آخر، يقال: <sup>486</sup>هو عبد الله بن رواحة، <sup>487</sup></p>

<sup>483</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113-14.

<sup>484</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:625.

<sup>485</sup> ثلاثة نفر منهم. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1317.

<sup>486</sup> يقال له. Ibid.

<sup>487</sup> عبد الله بن رواحة. Ibid.

<p>عليه وسلم من ذلك لأنه كان أول قتال التقى فيه المسلمون والمشركون، ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم شاهد معهم، فأحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن تكون الشوكة لبني عمه، فناداهم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن ارجعوا إلى مصافكم، وليقم إليهم بنو عمهم، فقام حمزة بن عبد المطلب، وعلي بن أبي طالب، وعبيدة بن الحارث ابن المطلب، فبرز حمزة لعتبة، وبرز عبيدة لشيبه، وبرز علي للوليد، فقتل حمزة لعتبة، وقتل عبيدة شيبه، وقتل علي الوليد، وضرب شيبه رجل عبيدة فقطعها، فاستنقذه حمزة وعلي، فحمل حتى توفي بالصفراء.</p>	<p>فقالوا: من أنتم؟ فقالوا: <sup>488</sup> رهط من الأنصار، قالوا: <sup>489</sup> ما لنا بكم من حاجة. ثم نادي مناديبهم: يا محمد، أخرج إلينا أكفاننا من قومنا، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث، <sup>490</sup> وقم يا حمزة، <sup>491</sup> وقم يا علي، <sup>492</sup> فلما قاموا ودنوا منهم، قالوا: من أنتم؟ قال عبيدة: عبيدة، وقال حمزة: حمزة، وقال علي: علي، قالوا: نعم، أكفاء كرام. فبارز عبيدة، <sup>493</sup> وكان أسن القوم، عتبة (بن) ربيعة، وبارز حمزة شيبه بن ربيعة، وبارز علي الوليد بن عتبة. فأما حمزة فلم يمهل شيبه أن قتله، وأما علي فلم يمهل الوليد أن قتله، واختلف عبيدة وعتبة بينهما ضربتين، كلاهما أثبت صاحبه، وكرّ حمزة وعلي بأسيا فها على عتبة فذفقا عليه، واحتملا <sup>494</sup> صاحبهما <sup>495</sup> فحازاه إلى <sup>496</sup> أصحابه.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The simplistic, matter-of-fact style in *Mūsā-v* is contrasted from Ibn Ishāq's animated, step-by-step recounting of events. The storyteller elements in Ibn Ishāq begin at the start with the Meccan challengers specifically positioned. Then three men of the Anṣār whose identities are precisely known stepped forward and exchanged principled words with the Meccans. When Muḥammad was requested to send forth peers in the place of the Anṣār, he summoned three Muslims, one at a time. Again, one at a time, the three Muslims disclosed their identities to the Meccans who then accepted them as worthy peers. After the combatants paired up, one by one, finally the single combats played out, one at a time.<sup>497</sup>

Present only in *Mūsā-v* is a report in which the Prophet was ashamed that the Anṣār and not the Muslims were the first to meet the Meccan challenge for single combat:

<sup>488</sup> قالوا. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1317.

<sup>489</sup> فقالوا. Ibid.

<sup>490</sup> قم يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب. Ibid.

<sup>491</sup> قم يا عبيدة بن الحارث. Ibid.

<sup>492</sup> قم يا علي ابن أبي طالب. Ibid.

<sup>493</sup> عبيدة بن الحارث. Ibid.

<sup>494</sup> فقتلاه واحتملا. Ibid., 1318.

<sup>495</sup> صاحبهما عبيدة. Ibid.

<sup>496</sup> فجاء به إلى. Ibid.

<sup>497</sup> To a lesser degree, the pairings and single combats are described one at a time in *Mūsā-v*. Thus the account in *Mūsā-v* may also include storyteller elements.

The Prophet was ashamed about that because the God-fearing were the first to fight between the Muslims and the polytheists. The Prophet was present with them, and he wanted the valor to go to the sons of his uncle. The Prophet called for them to return to their ranks.

The absence of this report from the narrative of Ibn Ishāq has the effect of depicting Muḥammad in a more glorified manner.<sup>498</sup> In this way, Ibn Ishāq’s version of the story resembles the pre-Islamic battle-day narratives known as the *Ayyām al-‘Arab* (Days of the Arab). These narratives were utilized as social entertainment and usually maintained the glorification of a particular tribe.<sup>499</sup> According to Alan Jones, there is no sound basis for accepting the stories of the *Ayyām*, or at least the details in them, as likely to be genuine, even though the central core of a story may well be based on fact.<sup>500</sup> Moreover much of the vivid details may be due to retelling over a period of time.

#### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 1

Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>501</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>502</sup>
‘Ātika d. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the aunt of the Prophet, lived in Mecca with her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. Before Badr and before the arrival of Ḍamḍam, she saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib at night, and when al-‘Abbās came to her, she said, “Last night I saw a vision which frightened me. I fear that disaster is upon your people.” He asked, “What did you see?” She replied, “I will not tell you until you promise me that you will not speak about it, for if they find out, then they will have us hear what we do not like.” When al-‘Abbās promised her, she said, “I	Three days before Ḍamḍam arrived in Mecca, ‘Ātika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and she said, “O my brother, by God last night I saw a vision which frightened me and I am afraid that evil and misfortune will come upon your people, so keep what I tell you to yourself.” He asked, “What did you see?” She replied, “I saw a rider coming upon a camel. He halted in the valley and shouted at the top of his voice, ‘Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days’ time.’ I saw the people gather around him; then he went into the mosque with the people

<sup>498</sup> According to Kister, “the glorification of the person of the Prophet . . . was indeed a continuation of a very early trend which . . . began shortly after the death of the Prophet.” Kister, “Sīrah Literature,” 356.

<sup>499</sup> Duels themselves were common motifs in *Ayyām al-‘Arab* literature. See Nisar Ahmed Faruqi, *Early Muslim Historiography: A Study of Early Transmitters of Arab History from the Rise of Islam up to the End of the Umayyad Period, 612-750 A.D.* (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1979), 37-42; Duri, *Rise of Historical Writing*, 16-22. The previous instance in which the religion in Islam is elevated also seems to maintain the glorification of a specific entity.

<sup>500</sup> *Et*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. “*Ayyām al-‘Arab*.”

<sup>501</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103-4.

<sup>502</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-9.

saw a rider approaching from the top of Mecca on his camel shouting at the top of his voice, 'O people of treachery, leave in two or three nights.' He drew near shouting and entered the mosque on his camel. When he had shouted three times, men, women and children inclined towards him, and they were greatly alarmed." She continued, "Then I saw him do the same on top of the Ka'ba on his camel, and he shouted three times, 'O people of treachery, O people of immorality, leave in two or three nights.' Then I saw him do the same on top of Abū Qubays likewise saying, 'O people of treachery' and 'O people of immorality,' until it was heard among the merchants of Mecca. Taking hold of a large rock and wresting it from its base, he dispatched it towards the people of Mecca. The rock propelled forward with a loud noise and when it hit the bottom of the mountain, it shattered. I do not know a dwelling or house in Mecca that a piece of that rock did not enter. Thus I feared for your people." . . .

[Abū Jahl said, "Ātika claimed that the rider said, 'Leave in two or three nights.' Now if these three [days] elapse, then Quraysh predicted your lie and we will record you as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka'ba (bayt) among the Arab men and women."]

following him. While they were around him, his camel mounted to the top of the Ka'ba. Then he shouted the same words, 'Come forth O people of treachery to your destruction in three days' time.' Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays, and he shouted the same thing. Then he took hold of a boulder, released it, and it began to fall. At the bottom of the mountain it shattered into pieces. There was neither a house among houses nor a dwelling in Mecca that a piece did not enter." . . .

[He [Abū Jahl] said, "O Banū 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?! 'Ātika claimed in her vision that someone said, 'Come forth in three days' time.' We will wait these three days. If what she says is true, then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka'ba among the Arabs."]

وكانت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب ساكنة بمكة، وهي عمّة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وكانت مع أخيها العباس بن عبد المطلب، فرأت رؤيا قبل بدر، وقبل قدوم ضمضم عليهم، ففزع منها، فأرسلت إلى أخيها: العباس بن عبد المطلب من ليلتها، فجاءها العباس، فقالت: رأيت الليلة رؤيا قد أسفقت منها، وخشيت على قومك منها الهلكة، قال: وماذا رأيت؟ قالت: لن أحدثك حتى تعاهدني أنك لا تذكرها فإنهم إن سمعوا آذونا وأسمعوننا ما لا نحب، فعاهدها العباس فقالت: رأيت راكبا أقبل من أعلى مكة على راحلته يصبح بأعلى صوته: يا آل غدر أخرجوا في ليلتين أو ثلاث، فأقبل يصبح حتى دخل المسجد على راحلته،

وقد رأت عاتكة بنت عبد المطلب، قبل قدوم ضمضم مكة بثلاث ليال، رؤيا أفزعتها. فبعثت إلى أخيها العباس بن عبد المطلب، فقالت له: يا أخي، والله لقد رأيت الليلة رؤيا أفظعتني، وتخوفت أن يدخل على قومك منها شرّ ومصيبة، فآتم عني<sup>503</sup> ما أحدثك به،<sup>504</sup> فقال لها: وما رأيت؟ قالت: رأيت راكبا أقبل على بعير له، حتى وقف بالأبطح، ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته: ألا<sup>505</sup> انفروا يا لغدر<sup>506</sup> لمصارعكم في ثلاث، فأرى الناس اجتمعوا إليه، ثم دخل المسجد والناس يتبعونه، فبينما<sup>507</sup> هم حوله، مثل به بعيره على ظهر الكعبة، ثم صرخ بمثلها: ألا<sup>508</sup> انفروا يا لغدر<sup>509</sup> لمصارعكم في ثلاث: ثم مثل به بعيره على رأس أبي قبيس، فصرخ

<sup>503</sup> علي. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1293.

<sup>504</sup> Ibid. أحدثك.

<sup>505</sup> Ibid. أن.

<sup>506</sup> Ibid. يال غدر.

<sup>507</sup> Ibid. فبينما.

<sup>508</sup> Ibid. ثم صرخ بأعلى صوته بمثلها أن.

<sup>509</sup> Ibid. يال غدر.

<p>فصاح ثلاث صيحات، ومال عليه الرجال والنساء والصبيان وفزع له الناس أشد الفزع، قالت: ثم أراه مثل على ظهر الكعبة على راحلته فصاح ثلاث صيحات، فقال: يا آل غدر ويا آل فجر: اخرجوا في ليلتين أو ثلاث، ثم أراه مثل على ظهر أبي قبيس، كذلك يقول يا آل غدر ويا آل فجر، حتى أسمع من بين الأخشبيين من أهل مكة، ثم عمد إلى صخرة عظيمة فنزعها من أصلها ثم أرسلوا على أهل مكة، فأقبلت الصخرة لها حسن شديد، حتى إذا كانت عند أصل الجبل ارفضت فلا أعلم بمكة داراً ولا بيتاً إلا قد دخلتها فلقة من تلك الصخرة فقد خشيت على قومك . . . .</p> <p>(وقال أبو جهل: زعمت عاتكة أن الراكب قال: اخرجوا في ليلتين أو ثلاث، فلو قد مضت هذه الثلاث تبيئت قريش كذبكم، وكتبنا سجلاً: أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب رجلاً وامراً.)</p>	<p>بمثلها. ثم أخذ صخرة فارسها. فأقبلت تهوى، حتى إذا كانت بأسفل الجبل ارفضت، فما بقي بيت من بيوت مكة، ولا دار إلا<sup>510</sup> دخلتها منها فلقة. . . .</p> <p>(قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن يتنبأ رجالكم حتى تتنبأ نساؤكم؟! قد زعمت عاتكة في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث، فسنترى بكم هذه الثلاث، فإن يك حقاً ما تقول فسيكون،<sup>511</sup> وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء، نكتب عليكم كتاباً أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.)</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The two versions are distinguishable in their manner of style. The flow of the narrative in Mūsā-v is more irregular and discontinuous than the that of Ibn Ishāq. The more polished style of Ibn Ishāq seems to be due to editorial activity which took place within his combined report.<sup>512</sup> In the scene in which the rider shouted a series of warnings to the people of Mecca, Mūsā-v has the warning as brief, uninformative and inexact: “Leave in two or three nights.” The warning in Ibn Ishāq’s version however is more lengthy, informative and specific: “Hasten to your disaster that will come in three days.” Later when Abū Jahl confronted al-‘Abbās about ‘Ātika’s vision, Abū Jahl repeated the inexact “two or three nights” in Mūsā-v whereas in Ibn Ishāq he repeated “three days.”

The more enhanced nature of Ibn Ishāq’s account is also indicated in view of the addressee of the rider’s three warnings. In Mūsā-v there is one addressee, the “people of treachery,” for the rider’s first warning and two addressees for the rider’s second and third warnings, the “people of treachery” and the “people of immorality.” This uneven manner in which the rider uttered the addressee(s) is absent from the version of Ibn

<sup>510</sup> ولا دار من دورها إلا Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1293.

<sup>511</sup> Ibid. فإن يكن ما قالت حقاً فسيكون

<sup>512</sup> The report’s *isnād*: “A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ‘Ikrima from Ibn ‘Abbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, told me [Ibn Ishāq], and they both said . . .” Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607. See also al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1292.

Ishāq which for all three proclamations has the addressee as consistently and only the “people of treachery.”

### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 2

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>513</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>514</sup>
<p>Al-‘Abbās was frightened from her vision. Then he departed from her and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a from the other night—al-Walīd was a friend of al-‘Abbās. He related to him the vision of ‘Ātika and ordered him to not tell anyone. But al-Walīd related it to his father ‘Utba, and ‘Utba related it to his brother Shayba. The story spread until it reached Abū Jahl b. Hishām, and it circulated among the people of Mecca.</p> <p>The next morning, al-‘Abbās circumambulated the Ka‘ba (<i>bayt</i>) and found in the mosque Abū Jahl, ‘Utba and Shayba, sons of Rabī‘a, Umayya, Ubayy b. Khalaf, Zam‘a b. al-Aswad and Abū al-Bakhtarī in a group of Quraysh talking. When they saw al-‘Abbās, Abū Jahl called out to him, “O Abū al-Faḍl, when you finish your circumambulation, come over to us.” And when he finished his circumambulation, he came and sat with them.</p> <p>When Abū Jahl asked, “What vision did ‘Ātika see?” he [al-‘Abbās] replied, “She did not see anything.” Then Abū Jahl said, “Were you not satisfied, O Banū Hāshim, with lying men so that you brought us lying women? We were like two horses in a race, and we were given the glory for a time. But when the riders grinded against one another, you said that a prophet is among us. Now he did not remain; nevertheless you say, ‘A prophetess is among us.’ I did not know among Quraysh, the people of the Ka‘ba, a more untruthful woman or man among you. And his offense was the greater insult.”</p> <p>Abū Jahl said, “‘Ātika claimed that</p>	<p>Al-‘Abbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-‘Abbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ‘Utba, and the story spread in Mecca until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings.</p> <p>Al-‘Abbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ‘Ātika’s vision. When Abū Jahl saw me he said, “O Abū al-Faḍl, when you have finished your circumambulation, come over to us.” When I finished, I went and sat with them, and Abū Jahl asked, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “That vision which ‘Ātika saw.” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: Then I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?! ‘Ātika claimed in her vision that someone said, ‘Come forth in three days’ time.’ We will wait these three days. If what she says is true, then so it will be, but if the three days pass and nothing happens, then we will write you down as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka‘ba among the Arabs.”</p> <p>He [Al-‘Abbās] said: By God, it was no great issue between us except that I contradicted that and denied that she had seen anything. Then we separated. When night came, there was not a</p>

<sup>513</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103-4.

<sup>514</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:607-9.

the rider said, 'Leave in two or three nights.' Now if these three [nights] elapse, then Quraysh predicted your lie and we will record you as the greatest liars of the people of the Ka'ba (bayt) among the Arab men and women. Were you not satisfied, O Banū Qaşayy, that you have taken the offices of the gatekeeper, council, and the provider of water, food and the banner for the pilgrimage so that you brought us a prophet from among you?"

Al-'Abbās asked, "Are you his obligation? The lie is among you and your people of the Ka'ba." He [Abū Jahl] said of their region, "O Abū al-Faḍl, I was neither ignorant nor stupid." Al-'Abbās suffered severe insult from 'Ātika in what spread from her vision.

woman from Banū al-Muṭṭalib who did not come to me. Each of them said, "Have you allowed this evil rascal [Abū Jahl] to attack your men and then go on with your women while you listened? Then you did not retaliate given what you heard?" He [Al-'Abbās] said: I said, "By God I have done so. It was no great issue between us, but I swear to God that I will confront him, and if he repeats what he said, then I will rid you of him."

ففرع العباس من رؤياها، ثم خرخ من عندها، فلقى الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة من آخر الليلة، وكان الوليد خلبلاً للعباس، فقصص عليه رؤيا عاتكة وأمره أن لا يذكرها لأحد، فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة، وذكرها عتبة لأخيه شيبه، فارتفع الحديث حتى بلغ أبا جهل بن هشام، واستفاض في أهل مكة.

فلما أصبحوا غدا العباس يطوف بالبيت فوجد في المسجد أبا جهل وعتبة وشيبه ابني ربيعة وأميه وأبي بن خلف وزمعة بن الأسود وأبا البخترى في نفر من قريش يتحدثون، فلما نظروا إلى العباس ناداه أبو جهل: يا أبا الفضل إذا قضيت طوافك فهلم إلينا فلما قضى طوافه جاء فجلس إليهم.

فقال أبو جهل: ما رؤيا رأتها عاتكة فقال: ما رأت من شيء. فقال أبو جهل أما رضيتم يا بني هاشم بكذب الرجال حتى جئتمونا بكذب النساء، إنا كنا وإياكم كفرسي رهان فاستبقنا المجد منذ حين فلما تحاكت الركب قلتم منا نبي، فما بقي إلا أن تقولوا: منا نبية، فما أعلم في قريش أهل بيت أكذب امرأة ولا رجلاً منكم، وأذاه أشد الأذى.

قال أبو جهل: زعمت عاتكة أن الراكب قال: اخرجوا في ليلتين أو ثلاث، فلو قد مضت هذه الثلاث تبيئت قريش كذبكم، وكتبنا سجلاً: أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب رجلاً وامرأة. أما رضيتم يا بني قصي أن ذهبتم بالحجابه والندوة والسقاية واللواء والرفادة، حتى

قال العباس: والله إن هذه لرؤيا، وأنت فاكتميتها، ولا تذكرها لأحد. ثم خرج العباس فلقى الوليد بن عتبة بن ربيعة، وكان له صديقاً، فذكرها له، واستكتمه إياه، فذكرها الوليد لأبيه عتبة، ففشا الحديث بمكة،<sup>515</sup> حتى تحدت به قريش في أنديةها.<sup>516</sup>

قال العباس: فغدوت لأطوف<sup>517</sup> بالبيت وأبو جهل بن هشام في رهط من قريش يعود، يتحدثون برؤيا عاتكة، فلما رأني أبو جهل قال: يا أبا الفضل، إذا فرغت من طوافك فأقبل إلينا، فلما<sup>518</sup> فرغت أقبلت،<sup>519</sup> حتى جلست معهم، فقال لي أبو جهل: يا بني عبد المطلب: متى حدثت فيكم هذه النبية؟ قال: قلت: وما ذاك؟ قال: تلك رؤيا<sup>520</sup> التي رأيت عاتكة، قال: فقلت: وما رأيت؟ قال: يا بني عبد المطلب، أما رضيتم أن يتنبأ رجالكم حتى تننبأ نساؤكم؟! قد زعمت عاتكة في رؤياها أنه قال: انفروا في ثلاث، فسنتربص بكم هذه الثلاث، فإن يك حقاً ما تقول فسيكون،<sup>522</sup> وإن تمض الثلاث ولم يكن من ذلك شيء، نكتب عليكم كتاباً أنكم أكذب أهل بيت في العرب.

قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إليه كبير، إلا أنني جددت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون رأت شيئاً. قال: ثم تفرقتنا. فلما أمسيت، لم تبق امرأة من بني عبد المطلب ألا أتتني، فقالت: أقررتم لهذا الفاسق الخبيث أن يقع في رجالكم، ثم قد تناول النساء وأنت تسمع، ثم لم يكن عندك غير لشيء مما سمعت، قال: قلت: قد والله فعلت،

<sup>515</sup> فشا الحديث Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1293.

<sup>516</sup> قريش. Ibid.

<sup>517</sup> أطوف. Ibid.

<sup>518</sup> قال فلما. Ibid.

<sup>519</sup> أقبلت إليه. Ibid.

<sup>520</sup> الرؤيا. Ibid., 1294.

<sup>521</sup> قلت. Ibid.

<sup>522</sup> فإن يكن ما قالت حقاً فسيكون. Ibid.

<p>جئتمونا بنبي منكم؟ فقال العباس: هل أنت منته، فإن الكذب فيك وفي أهل بيتك، فقال من حضرهما: ما كنت يا أبا الفضل جهولا، ولا خرقا. ولقى العباس من عاتكة فيما أفشى عليها من رؤياها أذى شديدا.</p>	<p>ما كان مني إليه من كبير. وأيم الله لا تعرّضنّ له، فإن عاد لأكفيكته.<sup>523</sup></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A difference between the two accounts has to do with the depiction of al-‘Abbās. In Mūsā-v, al-‘Abbās was caught lying by Abū Jahl who then reduced him with a couple insults. The first insult shamed al-‘Abbās for lying that ‘Ātika had not related her vision to him, and the following insult is an escalation of the first one, threatening to charge al-‘Abbās as being the Arabs’ greatest liar. After a final exchange between the two Meccan leaders, the report wraps up in the third person by asserting al-‘Abbās’s experience of severe insult.

In contrast, the corresponding narrative in Ibn Ishāq’s version displays al-‘Abbās in a favorable light.<sup>524</sup> Abū Jahl’s inflammatory accusations against him are both minimized and contradicted. Moreover, when the women of Banū al-Muṭṭalib accused al-‘Abbās of allowing Abū Jahl to insult his tribe, al-‘Abbās offered another contradiction, this time to the women’s accusation.

Thus whereas Mūsā-v is not characterized by pro-‘Abbāsīd bias, Ibn Ishāq’s material shows partiality towards al-‘Abbās.

### The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 3

<p>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>525</sup> When it was the evening of the third night after the night that ‘Ātika saw the vision, the rider who was sent by Abū</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>526</sup> On the third day after ‘Ātika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>523</sup> لأكفيكته. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1294.

<sup>524</sup> Elsewhere, al-‘Abbās is made to have been unwilling to fight against the Muslims at Badr. Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra* 1:628-29. The report runs: “Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ma’bad from one of his family from Ibn ‘Abbās told me [Ibn Ishāq] that the Prophet said to his companions that day, ‘I know that some of Banū Hāshim and others have been made to come out against their will, having no desire to fight us. Whoever of you meets one of Banū Hāshim, do not kill him; whoever meets Abū al-Bakhtarī b. Hishām b. al-Ḥārith b. Asad, do not kill him; and whoever meets al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the Prophet’s uncle, do not kill him, for he has been made to come out against his will.’” See also al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1323.

<sup>525</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:104.

<sup>526</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:609.

Sufyān, Ḍamḍam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī, came and shouted, “O people of Ghālib b. Fihir, hasten, for Muḥammad has set out and the people of Yathrib have opposed Abū Sufyān, so protect your caravan.” Quraysh were greatly frightened, and they were anxious because of the vision of ‘Ātika.

Al-‘Abbās said, “Such is this you claimed, accusing ‘Ātika of lying.” And they hastened on every refractory and tractable camel.

Abū Jahl said, “Does Muḥammad think it will be like what happened at Nakhla. He will know to restrain our caravan or not.”

which I wanted to get back at him. I went into the mosque and saw him. I walked towards him to confront him so that he could repeat some of what he had said so that I could attack him—he was a thin man with sharp features, a sharp tongue and a sharp glance. He [Al-‘Abbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-‘Abbās] said: I said to myself, “What is the matter with him? God curse him. Is all this out of fear that I will revile him?” He [Al-‘Abbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of Ḍamḍam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel’s nose, turned his saddle around, and torn his shirt, and he was saying, “O people of Quraysh, the caravan, the caravan! Your wealth is with Abū Sufyān, and Muḥammad and his companions have set out to intercept it. I do not think that you will reach it. Help! Help!” This diverted me from him, and he was diverted from me in our affair.

فلما كان مساء الليلة الثالثة من الليلة التي رأت عاتكة فيها الرؤيا، جاءهم الراكب الذي بعث أبو سفيان، وهو ضمضم بن عمرو الغفاري فصاح فقال: يا آل غالب بن فهو انفروا فقد خرج محمد وأهل يثرب يعترضون لأبي سفيان فأحرزوا غيركم، ففزعت قريش أشد الفزع، وأشفقوا من رؤيا عاتكة. وقال العباس: هذا زعمتم كذا وكذب عاتكة فنفروا على كل صعب وذلول. وقال أبو جهل: أبطن محمد أن يصيب مثل ما أصاب بنخلة سيعلم أنمنع غيرنا أم لا.

قال: فغدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤيا عاتكة، وأنا حديد مغضب، أرى أنى قد فاتتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه منه. قال: فدخلت المسجد فرأيتنه، فوالله إنى لأمشى نحوه أتعرضه، ليعود لبعض ما قال، فأقع به، وكان رجلا خفيفا، حديد الوجه، حديد اللسان حديد النظر. قال: إذ<sup>527</sup> خرج نحو باب المسجد يشتد. قال: فقلت<sup>528</sup> في نفسي: ما له لعنه الله، أكل هذا فرق مني<sup>529</sup> أن أشاتمته! قال: وإذا هو قد سمع ما لم أسمع: صوت ضمضم بن عمرو الغفاري، وهو يصرخ ببطن الوادي واقفا على بعيره، قد جدع بعيره، وحول رحله، وشق قميصه، وهو يقول: يا معشر قريش، اللطيمة اللطيمة، أموالكم مع أبي سفيان قد عرض لها محمد في أصحابه، لا أرى أن تدركوها، الغوث الغوث. قال: فشغلني عنه، وشغلني عني ما جاء من الأمر.

Ibn Ishāq supplies a series of reports that esteem al-‘Abbās. Al-‘Abbās himself is the narrator of the reports, and he is presented as heroic, fighting for the reputation of his tribe against a dominant leader. This depiction of al-‘Abbās is not present in the corresponding account in Mūsā-v.

<sup>527</sup> النظر إذ. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1295.

<sup>528</sup> قلت. Ibid.

<sup>529</sup> من. Ibid.

In addition, storyteller elements are included in Ibn Ishāq's version. The description of Abū Jahl as "a thin man with sharp features, sharp tongue, and sharp sight" is colorful and entertaining, and the description of Ḍamḍam "as he stood upon his camel, having cut its nose, turned its saddle round, and rent his shirt" is equally embellished. Such imaginative details are lacking in Mūsā-v which in contrast reflects a simple and straightforward narrative of events.

### Conclusion

Some differences distinguish the version of Ibn Ishāq from the version ascribed to Mūsā. For the council story, the outline is shared in both versions; yet the story's plot diverges between the versions. This divergence appears to be due to the editorial activity of Ibn Ishāq in the form of omissions and an addition. Moreover, whereas both versions include Qur'ānic material, Ibn Ishāq appears to have gone a step further by adding a Qur'ānic extract to a story. In turn, the story functioned as *asbāb al-nuzūl* for the Qur'ānic extract.

For the single combat story, Ibn Ishāq's version is characterized by *qāṣṣ* material whereas Mūsā-v is a more straightforward narration of events. In addition, Ibn Ishāq's version offers a more elevated position for the figure of Muḥammad and the religion of Islam than does Mūsā-v.

The two versions offer divergent depictions of al-'Abbās for the story of 'Ātika's vision. The positive portrayal by Ibn Ishāq seems not to have arisen with al-'Abbās himself but was probably created during the second Islamic century. The patronage of the 'Abbāsīd court to Ibn Ishāq would have ensured the positive portrayal, and the method of the combined report indicated by his more polished style offered Ibn Ishāq the liberty of incorporating and editing reports in favor of al-'Abbās. In contrast, the version attributed to Mūsā does not seem to have been affected politically.

## Part 2

As a whole, Ibn Ishāq's version of Badr is a great deal lengthier than that ascribed to Mūsā, consisting of approximately twenty-five additional reports. In contrast, the version ascribed to Mūsā consists of four reports not found in Ibn Ishāq's version. Nevertheless the two works have in common a significant number of reports which by and large are arranged in the same chronological order:<sup>530</sup>

1. The departure of the caravan led by Abū Sufyān from Syria to Mecca
2. Muḥammad's dispatch of the scouts 'Adī and Basbas to find the caravan
3. The discovery by Abū Sufyān of the spies by an examination of their camels' dung
4. The vision of 'Ātika
5. Juhaym's prophetic dream of the deaths of the Meccan chiefs
6. The change of mind and the return home of some Meccans
7. The council of war
8. The Muslims' capture and interrogation of two slaves of Quraysh
9. Al-Ḥubāb's advice to Muḥammad to fill all but one cistern
10. Rain sent by God which aids the Muslims but impedes the Meccans
11. 'Utba's advice to not fight Muḥammad
12. 'Umayr b. Wahb's estimation of the number of the Muslims
13. Muḥammad's sleep before the battle
14. The martyrdom of 'Umayr b. Ḥammām
15. Single combat
16. Muḥammad's prayer for assistance and Abū Bakr's affirmation of God's answer
17. Abū Jahl's prayer to God
18. The casting of pebbles by Muḥammad and the Muslims' victory over the Meccans
19. Exemptions from killing of certain Meccans by Muḥammad
20. The death of Abū al-Bakhtarī
21. Ibn Mas'ūd's slaying of Abū Jahl
22. Al-Ḥaysumān's report in Mecca of their defeat and the report's challenge by Ṣafwān
23. The death of 'Uqba b. Abī Mu'ayt
24. The casting of the Meccan slain into the well of Badr and Muḥammad's words concerning them

Many of these reports are similar in essence, maintaining much of the same storyline elements. Be that as it may, none of the corresponding reports are identical in wording, and some diverge significantly with respect to the storyline.

<sup>530</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:606-77; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1291-1359; al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:102-21.

To begin, the story of Juhaym’s prophetic dream of the deaths of the Meccan chiefs illustrates the resemblance yet disparity between the accounts in Mūsā-v and Ibn Ishāq:

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>531</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>532</sup>
<p>They traveled until they arrived at al-Juḥfa. Descending in the evening, they drew some water. Among them was a man from Banū al-Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abd Manāf, said to have been Juhaym b. al-Ṣalt b. Makhrama. After Juhaym laid his head down and fell asleep, he awoke alarmed and asked his friends, “Did you see the horseman who rode haughtily towards me?” They replied, “No, you are crazy.” He continued, “The horseman came haughtily towards me and declared, ‘Slain are Abū Jahl, ‘Utba, Shayba, Zam‘a, Abū al-Bakhtarī, Umayya b. Khalaf,’ and he named the chiefs of unbelieving Quraysh.” Then he said to his friends, “Satan has duped you.” Juhaym presented the story to Abū Jahl, who said, “You have brought to us the lie of Banū al-Muṭṭalib with the lie of Banū Hāshim. You will see tomorrow who will be killed.”</p>	<p>Quraysh advanced and when they reached al-Juḥfa, Juhaym b. al-Ṣalt b. Makhrama b. al-Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abd Manāf saw a vision. He said, “Between sleep and wakefulness I saw a vision. I saw a man coming on a horse; he had with him a camel. He halted and said, ‘Slain are ‘Utba b. Rabī‘a, Shayba b. Rabī‘a, Abū al-Ḥakam b. Hishām, Umayya b. Khalaf, and so-and-so and so-and-so—enumerating the men, the chiefs of Quraysh, who were killed at Badr. Then I saw him stab his camel in the chest and send it loose into the camp. There was not a single tent in the camp that was not spattered with its blood.” He [Ibn Ishāq] said: When the story reached Abū Jahl, he said, “This is yet another prophet from Banū al-Muṭṭalib. He will know tomorrow who will be killed, if we meet in battle.”</p>
<p>فساروا حتى نزلوا الجحفة. نزلوها عشاء يتروون من الماء، وفيهم رجل من بني المطلب بن عبد مناف يقال له جهيم بن الصلت بن مخرمة، فوضع جهيم رأسه فأغفى ثم فزع فقال لأصحابه: هل رأيتم الفارس الذي وقف عليّ أنفا فقالوا لا. فإنك مجنون. فقال قد وقف عليّ فارس أنفا فقال: قتل أبو جهل، وعتبة، وشيبة، وزمعة، وأبو البخترى، وأمّية بن خلف، فعدّ أشرافا من كفار قريش، فقال له أصحابه: إنما لعب بك الشيطان ورفع حديث جهيم إلى أبي جهل، فقال قد جنتمونا بكذب بني المطلب مع كذب بني هاشم، سترون غدا من يقتل.</p>	<p>وأقبلت قريش، فلما نزلوا الجحفة، رأى جهيم بن الصلت ابن مخرمة بن المطلب بن عبد مناف رؤيا، فقال: إني رأيت فيما يرى النائم، وإني لبين النائم واليقظان. إذ نظرت إلى رجل قد أقبل على فرس، حتى وقف، ومعه بعير له، ثم قال: قتل عتبة بن ربيعة، وشيبة بن ربيعة، وأبو الحكم بن هشام، وأمّية بن خلف، وفلان وفلان، فعدّ رجالا ممن قتل يوم بدر، من أشراف قريش، ثم رأيت ضرب في لبة بعيره، ثم أرسله في العسكر، فما بقى خباء من أخبية العسكر إلا أصابه نضح من دمه. قال: فبلغت أبا جهل، فقال: وهذا أيضا نبي آخر من بني المطلب، سيعلم غدا من المقتول إن نحن التقينا.</p>

The main theme of the story—Juhaym prophesied the deaths of the Meccan leaders—is clearly conveyed in both versions. Many of the story’s details are also the same; nevertheless a few variants stand out. Only in the version of Ibn Ishāq does the rider on the horse have with him a camel which he stabbed in the chest and sent loose into the

<sup>531</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:105-6.

<sup>532</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:618.

Meccan camp; then blood from the camel spattered onto each tent. Exclusively in Mūsā-v is Satan's subterfuge which is pointed out by Juhaym to his friends.<sup>533</sup>

In much the same way, the essence of the story of the fulfillment of Juhaym's prophecy remains the same in both Mūsā-v and Ibn Ishāq:

Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>534</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>535</sup>
<p>Quraysh returned to Mecca defeated and put to flight. The first who arrived with news of the polytheists' defeat was al-Ḥaysumān al-Ka'bī, the grandfather of Ḥasan b. Ghīlān. The people gathered at the Ka'ba, questioning him, and there was not a man among the chiefs of Quraysh about whom they asked whose death he did not announce.</p> <p>Ṣafwān b. Umayya, seated with a group of Quraysh in the <i>hijr</i>, said, "By God, this man has lost his senses. His mind is confused, for he has forgotten who I am. I think that he will name me as one of the dead." Then some of the people asked al-Ḥaysumān, "Do you have knowledge about Ṣafwān b. Umayya?" He answered, "Yes, he is there sitting in the <i>hijr</i>. I saw the killing of his father Umayya b. Khalaf."</p>	<p>The first of the arrivals to Mecca from Quraysh was al-Ḥaysumān b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khuzā'ī. When they asked, "What happened?" he replied, "Slain are 'Utba b. Rabī'a, Shayba b. Rabī'a, Abū al-Ḥakam b. Hishām, Umayya b. Khalaf, Zam'a b. al-Aswad, Nubayh and Munabbih, the sons of al-Ḥajjāj, and Abū al-Bakhtarī b. Hishām. When he began to enumerate the chiefs of Quraysh, Ṣafwān b. Umayya who was sitting in the <i>hijr</i> said, "By God, if this man is in his right mind, ask him about me." So they asked, "What happened to Ṣafwān b. Umayya?" He answered, "There he is sitting in the <i>hijr</i>, and by God I saw his father and his brother when they were killed."</p>
<p>ورجعت قريش إلى مكة مغلوبين منهزمين وكان أول من قدم بهزيمة المشركين الحيسمان الكعبي وهو جد حسن بن غيلان، فاجتمع عليه الناس عند الكعبة يسألونه لا يسأل عن رجل من أشرف قريش إلا نعاه.</p> <p>فقال صفوان بن أمية وهو قاعد مع نفر من قريش في الحجر: والله ما يعقل هذا الرجل، ولقد طار قلبه سلوه عني فإني أظنه سوف ينعاني، فقال بعضهم للحيسمان هل لك علم بصفوان بن أمية؟ قال نعم هو ذلك جالس في الحجر، ولقد رأيت أباه أمية ابن خلف قتل.</p>	<p>وكان أول من قدم مكة قريش، الحيسمان بن عبد الله الخزاعي، فقالوا: ما وراءك؟ قال: قتل عتبة بن ربيعة، وشيبة بن ربيعة، وأبو الحكم بن هشام، وأمّية بن خلف، وزمعة بن الأسود، ونبيه ومنبه ابنا الحجاج، وأبو البختري بن هشام، فلما جعل يعدد أشرف قريش، قال صفوان بن أمية، وهو قاعد في الحجر: والله إن يعقل هذا، فاسئلوه عني، فقالوا: ما فعل صفوان بن أمية؟ قال: هاهو ذلك جالسا في الحجر، وقد والله رأيت أباه وأخاه حين قتل.</p>

As for the details, Mūsā-v includes a number of components lacking in Ibn Ishāq. Mūsā-v: 1) identifies al-Ḥaysumān as the grandfather of Ḥasan b. Ghīlān; 2) recounts the Meccans' gathering at the Ka'ba upon al-Ḥaysumān's arrival; and 3) supplies an

<sup>533</sup> Satan's role as a deceiver is a distinct topos in Mūsā-v. The satanic topos is also present in the account in which the polytheists advanced with Iblīs in the form of Surāqa b. Ju'sham al-Madliji. Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:111.

<sup>534</sup> Ibid., 116.

<sup>535</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:646.

elongated criticism of al-Ḥaysumān by Ṣafwān. Notwithstanding one component present exclusively in Ibn Ishāq: al-Ḥaysumān's report of the killing of Ṣafwān's brother, the account in Mūsā-v gives the appearance of being an expanded version of the account in Ibn Ishāq.

Elsewhere, the converse is observable. For the report in which some Meccans changed their mind about reaching Badr, Ibn Ishāq's account gives the appearance of being an expanded version of the account in Mūsā-v:

Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>536</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>537</sup>
<p>Abū Sufyān went down and adhered to the coast, for he feared the report at Badr. He wrote to Quraysh after he had diverged from the path of the Prophet and had perceived that he saved the caravan. He ordered Quraysh to go back: "You set out to protect your caravan, but I have saved it." The message reached Quraysh at Juḥfa where Abū Jahl said, "By God, we will not return until we reach Badr and rest and eat from our place among the Arabs. Not one of the Arabs who sees us will dare fight us."</p> <p>Al-Akhnas b. Sharīq disagreed with that and desired to go back. His advice to return was declined by Quraysh, for foolish fanaticism had taken over them. Giving up hope in Quraysh, al-Akhnas turned to Banū Zuhra who obeyed him and went back. Not one of them participated at Badr. They were joyous over the opinion of al-Akhnas, and they blessed him. But he did not remain faithful until he died.</p> <p>Banū Hāshim desired to return with those who returned but Abū Jahl was vehement with them, saying, "By God, do not leave this troop until we return."</p>	<p>When Abū Sufyān saw that he had saved his caravan he sent to Quraysh saying, "You came out to protect your caravan, your men, and your property. God has saved them, so go back." But Abū Jahl b. Hishām said, "By God, we will not go back until we have been to Badr—Badr was a site for one of the Arab festivals where a market was held every year—We will spend three days there, slaughter camels, eat food, drink wine, and the girls will perform for us. The Arabs will hear that we have come and gathered together, and they will continue to hold us in respect. So go ahead!"</p> <p>Al-Akhnas b. Sharīq b. 'Amr b. Wahb al-Thaqafī, an ally of Banū Zuhra who was in al-Juḥfa, said, "O Banū Zuhra, God has saved your property and rescued your companion Makhrama b. Nawfal. You came out to protect him and his property. Lay any charge of cowardice on me and head back. There is no need for you to go except for profit. Ignore what this man is saying," meaning Abū Jahl. So they went back and not one Zuhrite was present at Badr. They obeyed him because he was their authority. There was not a clan of Quraysh that was not represented except for Banū 'Adīy b. Ka'b, from which not a single man went out. Since Banū Zuhra went with al-Akhnas b. Sharīq, no one from these two clans was present at Badr. The rest went</p>

<sup>536</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:108.

<sup>537</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:618-19.

	<p>on. In the discourse between Ṭālib b. Abū Ṭālib, who was with the army, and some of Quraysh, Quraysh said, “By God, we know, O Banū Hāshim, that even if you have come out with us your sympathies lie with Muḥammad.” So Ṭālib returned to Mecca with the others.</p>
<p>وخفض أبو سفيان، فلصق بساحل البحر وخاف الرصد على بدر وكتب إلى قريش حين خالف مسير رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ورأى أنه قد أحرز ما معه، وأمرهم أن يرجعوا فإنما خرجتم لتحرزوا ركبكم فقد أحرز لكم فلقبهم هذا الخبر بالجحفة فقال أبو جهل: والله لا نرجع حتى نقدم بدرا فنقيم بها ونطعم من حضرنا من العرب فإنه لن يرانا أحد من العرب فيقاتلنا. فكره ذلك الأخنس بن شريق فأحب أن يرجعوا. وأشار عليهم بالرجعة فأبوا وعصوه وأخذتهم حمية الجاهلية، فلما ينس الأخنس من رجوع قريش أكب على بني زهرة فأطاعوه فرجعوا، فلم يشهد أحد منهم بدرا واغتبطوا برأي الأخنس وتبركوا به، فلم يزل فيهم مطاعا حتى مات.</p> <p>وأرادت بنو هاشم الرجوع فيمن رجع فاشتد عليهم أبو جهل بن هشام، وقال: والله لا تفارقنا هذه العصابة حتى نرجع.</p>	<p>ولما رأى أبو سفيان أنه قد أحرز غيره، أرسل إلى قريش: إنكم إنما خرجتم لتمنعوا عبركم ورجالكم وأموالكم، فقد نجأها الله، فارجعوا، فقال أبو جهل بن هشام: والله لا نرجع حتى نرد بدرا – وكان بدر موسما من مواسم العرب، يجتمع لهم به سوق كل عام – فنقيم عليه ثلاثا، فننحر الجزر، ونطعم الطعام ونسقى الخمر، وتعزف علينا القيان، وتسمع بنا العرب، وبمسيرنا وجمعنا،<sup>538</sup> فلا يزالون يهابوننا أبدا بعدها، فامضوا.</p> <p>وقال الأخنس بن شريق عمرو بن وهب الثقفي، وكان حليفا لبني زهرة وهم بالجحفة: يا بني زهرة، قد نجى الله لكم أموالكم، وخلص لكم صاحبكم مخزومة بن نوفل، وإنما نفرتم لتمنعوه وماله، فاجعلوا لى جنبها وارجعوا، فإنه لا حاجة لكم بأن تخرجوا في غير ضيعة، لاما يقول هذا، يعنى أبا جهل. فرجعوا، فلم يشهدا زهرى واحد، أطاعوه وكان فيهم مطاعا. ولم يكن بقى من قريش بطن إلا وقد نفر منهم ناس، إلا بنى عدى بن كعب، ولم يخرج منهم رجل واحد، فرجعت بنو زهرة مع الأخنس بن شريق، فلم يشهد بدرا من هاتين القبيلتين أحد، ومضى القوم. وكان بين طالب بن أبى طالب – وكان في القوم – وبين بعض قريش محاوره، فقالوا: والله لقد عرفنا يا بني هاشم، وإن خرجتم معنا، أن هواكم لمع محمد. فرجع طالب إلى مكة مع من رجع.</p>

In Ibn Ishāq, the assertions by Abū Sufyān and Abū Jahl contain more detail, an explanatory note is provided, and more particulars concerning the Meccans who returned home are given. Though noteworthy, this extra material does not affect the main storyline which is unmistakably the same and conveyed in both versions.

Significant divergences in storyline are observable in other reports. For example, the death of ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt is reported discordantly:

<p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>539</sup></p> <p>He did not kill the bound prisoners except for ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt. ‘Āṣim b. Thābit b. Abī al-Aqlaḥ, brother of Banū ‘Amr b. ‘Awf, killed him. When ‘Uqba</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>540</sup></p> <p>He [Muḥammad] went on, and in ‘Irq al-Zabya, he killed ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt. He who had captured ‘Uqba was ‘Abd Allāh b. Salima, one of Banū al-</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>538</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1307.

<sup>539</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:117.

<sup>540</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:644.

<p>caught sight of him in front of him, he called for help from Quraysh, saying, “O people of learned Quraysh, for what am I to be killed here?” The Prophet replied, “For your enmity against God and His messenger.”</p>	<p>‘Ajlān. When the Prophet ordered him to be killed, ‘Uqba said, “But who will look after my children, O Muḥammad?” “Hell,” he answered, and ‘Aṣīm b. Thābit b. Abū al-Aqlaḥ al-Anṣārī, a member of Banū ‘Amr b. ‘Awf, killed him, according to what Abū ‘Ubayda b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ammār b. Yāsir told me.</p>
<p>ولم يقتل من الأسرى صبيرا غير عقبة بن أبي معيط قتله عاصم بن ثابت بن أبي الأفلح أخو بني عمرو ابن عوف لما أبصره عقبة مقبلا إليه استغاث بقريش فقال يا معشر قريش علام أقتل من بين من ها هنا؟ فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على عداوتك الله ورسوله.</p>	<p>ثم خرج حتى إذا كان بعرق الظبية قتل عقبة بن أبي معيط. والذي أسر عقبة: عبد الله بن سلمة أحد بني العجلان. فقال عقبة حين أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقتله: فمن للصبيبة يا محمد؟ قال: النار. فقتله عاصم بن ثابت بن أبي الأفلح الأنصاري، أخو بني عمرو بن عوف، كما حدثني أبو عبيدة بن محمد بن عمّار بن ياسر.</p>

Whereas Mūsā-v focuses on ‘Uqba’s crime of possessing enmity against God and His messenger, Ibn Ishāq’s version has to do with ‘Uqba’s concern for his children and Muḥammad’s harsh riposte concerning them.

An example of a storyline’s divergence in which both versions supply their sources is found in the report of the burial of the Meccan slain:

<p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>541</sup></p> <p>The Prophet ordered the slain of Quraysh from among the polytheists to be cast into the well of Badr. He cursed them as he stood, calling them by name, except for Umayya b. Khalaf who was a stout man who had fattened in his day. When they attempted to throw him in the well, he burst open. The Prophet said, calling and cursing them, “Have you found what your Lord promised to be true?”</p> <p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba—Nāfi’—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar—Anās from his companions said, “O messenger of God, are you able to call out to those who died?” The Prophet answered, “You did not hear what I said to them.”</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>542</sup></p> <p>Yazīd b. Rūmān—‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr—‘Ā’isha: When the Prophet ordered the dead to be thrown into the well, they were thrown in except for Umayya b. Khalaf. He had swollen up in his armor and filled it. They went to move him, but he fell apart so they left him where he was and heaped earth and stones upon him. When they threw the dead into the well, the Prophet stood over them and said, “O people of the well, have you found what your Lord promised you to be true? For I have found what my Lord promised me to be true.” She [‘Ā’isha] said: His companions asked him, “O messenger of God, are you speaking to dead people?” He replied, “They know that what their Lord promised them is true.”</p> <p>‘Ā’isha said: The people say [that he</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>541</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:117.

<sup>542</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:638-39.

<p>وأمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بقتلى قريش من المشركين فألقوا في قليب بدر ولعنهم وهو قائم يسميهم بأسمائهم غير أن أمية بن خلف كان رجلاً مسماً فانتفخ في يومه فلما أرادوا أن يلقوه في القليب تفقأ، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: دعوه، وهو يلعنهم: هل وجدتم ما وعد ربكم حقاً؟ قال موسى بن عقبة، قال نافع، قال عبد الله بن عمر: قال أناس من أصحابه يا رسول الله أتنادي ناساً موتى؟ فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما أنتم بأسمع لما قلت منهم.</p>	<p>said], “They hear what I say to them,” but the Prophet said to them, “They know.”</p> <p>وحدثني يزيد بن رومان عن عروة بن الزبير، عن عائشة، قالت: لما أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالقتلى أن يطرحوا في القليب، طرحوا فيه، إلا ما كان من أمية بن خلف، فإنه انتفخ في درعه فملاًها، فذهبوا ليحركوه، فتزائل لحمه،<sup>543</sup> فأقروه، وألقوا عليه ما غيبه من التراب والحجارة. فلما ألفاهم في القليب، وقف عليهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال: يا أهل القليب، هل وجدتم ما وعدكم ربكم حقاً؟ فإني قد وجدت ما وعدني ربي حقاً. قالت: فقال له أصحابه: يا رسول الله، أتكلّم قوماً موتى؟ فقال لهم: لقد علموا أن ما وعدهم ربهم حقاً.</p> <p>قالت عائشة: والناس يقولون: لقد سمعوا ما قلت لهم، وإنما قال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: لقد علموا.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The sources referred to have in common that Muḥammad provided a reply when the Muslims questioned him about speaking to dead people. As far as the substance of Muḥammad’s reply is concerned however, the two versions report distinct narratives.

In addition to storyline divergences, the variants between the versions affect the manner in which a story is presented. One such difference in presentation has to do with the level of certainty expressed in the report. For the story of the death of Abū al-Bakhtarī, Mūsā-v makes clear its inconclusiveness concerning the responsible person for Abū al-Bakhtarī’s killing. Ibn Ishāq however asserts al-Mujadhdhar as his slayer:

<p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>544</sup></p> <p>The Prophet had ordered the Muslims before the battle that if they ran into ‘Abbās, ‘Uqayl, Nawfal b. al-Ḥārith, or al-Bakhtarī, they were not to be killed. By the Prophet’s order, these and other individuals were captured, with the exception of Abū al-Bakhtarī, who refused to surrender. They say of him—it is alleged—that the Prophet ordered them not to kill him if he surrendered. However, he refused and was captured by many men whom the Prophet had not given his order but who sought ransom money. He [Mūsā] said: The people allege</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>545</sup></p> <p>Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ma‘bad— one of his family—Ibn ‘Abbās: The Prophet said to his companions that day, “I know that some men of Banū Hāshim and others have come out unwillingly and saw no need to fight us; so whoever meets anyone from Banū Hāshim, do not kill him; and whoever meets Abū al-Bakhtarī b. al-Ḥārith b. Asad, do not kill him; neither kill al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the Prophet’s uncle, for he has been forced to come out.” Abū Ḥudhayfa replied, “Are we to kill our fathers, our sons, our brothers, and our families and</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>543</sup> فتزائل. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1331.

<sup>544</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:115-16.

<sup>545</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:628-30.

that Abū al-Yasar killed Abū al-Bakhtarī – but this is also denied by important others, except to say that it was al-Mujaddar who killed him, or Abū Dāwud al-Māzanī killed him and stripped him of his sword and kept it until it was sold to some members of the tribe of Abū al-Bakhtarī. Al-Mujaddar said,

Tell the orphan when you met al-Bakhtarī.

Tell the same about me, my son.  
I am he who claims to pray when in trial.  
I pierced [him] with a spear until it was bent.

They alleged that al-Mujaddar implored Abū al-Bakhtarī not to surrender, informing him that the Prophet forbade his killing if he surrendered. Abū al-Bakhtarī however refused to surrender and incited al-Mujaddar with his sword. The Anṣārī first pierced him in the middle of the chest and then finished him off.

leave al-‘Abbās? By God, if I meet him, I will drive my sword into his flesh.”

When his words reached the Prophet, he said to ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, “O Abū Ḥafṣ”—and ‘Umar said, “By God, it was the first time the Prophet called me Abū Ḥafṣ.”—“should the face of the Prophet’s uncle be struck by the sword?” ‘Umar replied, “O messenger of God, call upon me and I will behead him with my sword. By God, he has played the hypocrite.” Abū Ḥudhayfa used to say, “I did not feel safe from those words that I spoke that day. I remained fearful except that martyrdom would atone for them.” He was killed as a martyr on the day of al-Yamāma.

The Prophet forbade the killing of Abū al-Bakhtarī because he had held back the people from the Prophet while he was in Mecca; he neither harmed him nor did anything against him, and he stood for the invalidation of the record that Quraysh had written against Banū Hāshim and Banū al-Muṭṭalib. Al-Mujadhdhar b. Dhiyād al-Balawī, an ally of the Anṣār, met him. He [Al-Mujadhdhar] was of Banū Sālim b. ‘Awf. Al-Mujadhdhar told Abū al-Bakhtarī, “The Prophet has forbidden us to kill you—with Abū al-Bakhtarī was his companion who had left with him from Mecca, Junāda b. Mulayḥa d. Zuhayr b. al-Ḥārith b. Asad; Junāda was a man of Banū Layth, and the name of Abū al-Bakhtarī was al-‘Āṣ—He [Abū al-Bakhtarī] said, “And my companion?” “No by God,” al-Mujadhdhar replied to him, “we will not leave your companion alone. The Prophet’s order was for you only.” He said, “No, by God, in that case I will die, he and I together. The women of Mecca will not say that I left my companion out of greed for life.” . . . Al-Mujadhdhar b. Dhiyār killed him . . . Then al-Mujadhdhar came to the Prophet and said, “By Him who sent you with the truth, I tried to get him to give himself up so that I could bring him to you; however he fought me, so I fought him and killed him.”

المسلمين قبل القتال إن رأوا الظهور أن لا يقتلوا عباسا، ولا عقيلًا، ولا نوفل بن الحرث ولا البخترى في رجال، فأسر هؤلاء النفر في رجال ممن أوصى بهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وغيرهم إلا أبا البخترى فإنه أبا أن يستأسر وذكروا له - زعموا: أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد أمرهم أن لا يقتلوه إن استأسر، فأبى وأسر بشر كثير ممن لم يأمر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بإساره التماس الفداء، قال: ويزعم ناس أن أبا اليسر قتل أبا البخترى - ويأبى عظيم الناس، إلا أن المجدر، هو الذي قتله، بل قتله أبو داود المازني، وسلبه سيفه وكان عند بنيه حتى باعه بعضهم من بعض بني أبي البخترى. وقال المجدر:

بشّر بيتم إن لقيت البخترى  
وبشّر بمثلها مني بني  
أنا الذي أزعم أصلي من بلي  
أطعن بالحربة حتى تنتني.

فزعموا أنه ناشده ألا استأسر وأخبره أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نهى عن قتله إن استأسر فأبى البخترى أن يستأسر وشدّ عليه بالسيف فطعنه الأنصاري بين ثدييه وأجهز عليه.

أهله، عن ابن عباس: أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لأصحابه يومئذ: إني قد عرفت أن رجلا من بني هاشم وغيرهم قد أخرجوا كرها، لا حاجة لهم بقتالنا، فمن لقي منكم أحدا من بني هاشم فلا يقتله، ومن لقي أبا البخترى بن هشام بن الحارث ابن أسد فلا يقتله، ومن لقي العباس بن عبد المطلب، عم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلا يقتله، فإنه إنما أخرج مستكرها. قال: فقال أبو حذيفة: أنقتل آباءنا وأبناءنا وإخوتنا وعشيرتنا، ونترك العباس، والله لئن لقيته لأحمته السيف.

فبلغت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال لعمر بن الخطاب: يا أبا حفص - قال عمر: والله إنه لأول يوم كنتاني فيه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأبي حفص - أياضرب وجه عم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالسيف؟ فقال عمر: يا رسول الله، دعني فلاضرب عنقه بالسيف، فوالله لقد نافق. فكان أبو حذيفة يقول: ما أنا يأمن من تلك الكلمة التي قلت يومئذ، ولا أزال منها خائفا، إلا أن تكفرها عنى الشهادة. فقتل يوم اليمامة شهيدا.

وإنما نهى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن قتل أبي البخترى، لأنه كان أكف القوم عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو بمكة، وكان لا يؤذيه، ولا يبلغه عنه شيء يكرهه، وكان ممن قام في نقض الصحيفة، التي كتبت قريش على بني هاشم وبني المطلب. فلقية المجدر بن زياد البلوي، حليف الأنصار، ثم من بني سالم بن عوف، فقال المجدر لأبي البخترى: إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد نهانا عن قتلك - ومع أبي البخترى زميل له، قد خرج معه من مكة، وهو جنادة بن مليحة بنت زهير بن الحارث بن أسد، وجنادة رجل من بني ليث. واسم أبي البخترى: العاص - قال: وزميلي؟ فقال له المجدر: لا والله، ما نحن بتاركي زميلك، ما أمرنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا بك وحدك، فقال لا والله، إذن لأموتن أنا وهو جميعا، لا تتحدث عنى نساء مكة<sup>546</sup> أنى تركت زميلي حرصا على الحياة. . . فقتله المجدر بن زياد. . . ثم إن المجدر أتى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال: والذي بعثك بالحق، لقد جهدت عليه أن يستأسر فأتيتك به، إلا أن يقاتلني، فقاتلته فقتلته.

A story's presentation also differs with respect to its location(s) within the narrative. In Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad's sleep prior to the battle and his interaction with Abū Bakr concisely comprise one report. In Mūsā-v however, the two events are found in disparate locations within the Badr narrative:

Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>547</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>548</sup>
As the Prophet was prostrate, he	Then the Prophet straightened the

<sup>546</sup> نساء قريش من أهل مكة. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1324.

<sup>547</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113-14.

<sup>548</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:626-27.

said to his companions, "Do not fight until you are told." Then sleep descended upon him. When the forces gained sight of each other, Abū Bakr began to say, "O messenger of God, the enemy has come and is upon us." Then the Prophet awoke. God Most High had shown the enemy's number as few in his sleep, and in the eyes of the polytheists, the Muslims were seen as few until the forces came upon each other. For if they had seen a large number, then they would have remained and disputed the matter, as God Mighty and Majestic said. . . .

The Muslims cried out to God, beseeching Him for help when they saw that the battle had broken out. The Prophet raised his hands to God Most High, asking for what He had promised and for assistance, and he was saying, "O God, give victory over this troop, victory over polytheism which did not honor your religion." Abū Bakr, may God be pleased with him, was saying, "O messenger of God, by Him in whose hand is my soul, may God Mighty and Majestic send His help to you and may He vindicate your face." Then God Mighty and Majestic sent down an army of angels upon the shoulders of the enemy. The Prophet said, "God has sent His assistance, for the angels have come. Rejoice O Abū Bakr, for I saw Gabriel, upon whom be peace, wearing a turban and leading his horse, and he was between heaven and earth. When he descended onto the earth, he halted and disappeared from my sight for one hour. Then I saw him among the clouds."

ranks and returned to the hut and entered it. With him was Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq and no one else. The Prophet implored the Lord for the help that He had promised him, and he was saying, among other things, "O God, if this band perishes today, then you will not be worshipped after today." Abū Bakr was saying, "O prophet of God, do not call upon your Lord, for God will fulfill what he promised you." The Prophet slept a light sleep in the hut. Then he awoke and said, "Rejoice O Abū Bakr. God's help has come to you. There is Gabriel holding the reins of his horse and leading it; on his front teeth is dust."

واضطجع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال لأصحابه: لا تقاتلوا حتى أؤذنكم وغشيه نوم فغلبه، فلما نظر بعض القوم إلى بعض، جعل أبو بكر يقول: يا رسول الله قد دنا القوم ونالوا منا، فاستيقظ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وقد أراه الله تعالى إياهم في منامه قليلا، وقلل المسلمين في أعين المشركين، حتى طمع بعض القوم في بعض، ولو أراه عددا كثيرا لقتلوا ولتتازعوا في الأمر كما قال الله عز وجل . . . وعج المسلمون إلى الله يسألونه النصر حين رأوا القتال قد نشب، ورفع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يديه إلى الله تعالى يسأله ما وعده ويسأله النصر، ويقول: اللهم أن ظهر على هذه العصاة ظهر الشرك، ولم يبق لك دين. وأبو بكر رضي الله عنه يقول: يا

ثم عدل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الصفوف، ورجع إلى العريش فدخله، ومعه فيه أبو بكر الصديق، ليس معه فيه غيره، ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يناشد ربه ما وعده من النصر، ويقول فيما يقول: اللهم إن تهلك هذه العصاة اليوم لا تعبد، وأبو بكر: يا نبي الله: بعض مناشدتك ربك، فإن الله منجز لك ما وعدك. وقد حقق رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خفقة وهو في العريش، ثم انتبه فقال: أبشر يا أبا بكر، أتاك نصر الله. هذا جبريل أخذ بعنان فرس يقوده، على ثناياه النقع.

رسول الله والذي نفسي بيده لينصرك الله عز وجل  
وليبيضن وجهك، فأنزل الله عز وجل من الملائكة جندا  
في أكتاف العدو. فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم:  
قد أنزل الله نصره ونزلت الملائكة أبشرا يا أبا بكر،  
فإني قد رأيت جبريل عليه السلام معتجرا يقود فرسا  
بين السماء والأرض. فلما هبط إلى الأرض جلس عليها  
فتغيب عني ساعة ثم رأيت على شقيبه غبارا!

Also worthy of notice is the Qur'ānic nature of Mūsā-v. The passage that describes the contents of Muḥammad's dream serves as the context for Q. 8:44. Thus the inclination to include *asbāb al-nuzūl* in the Badr narrative is in Mūsā-v as well as in Ibn Ishāq.<sup>549</sup>

Nowhere is this penchant in Mūsā-v more evident than in the story of Abū Jahl's prayer to God and the subsequent Meccan defeat. *Asbāb al-nuzūl* are provided for Q. 8:12 and Q. 8:48:<sup>550</sup>

Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>551</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>552</sup>
Abū Jahl said, "O God, vindicate the best of the religions, O God, either our ancient religion or the gossip of Muḥammad's religion." Satan recoiled on his heels when he saw the angels. He cleared himself from aiding his followers [the Meccans]. God Mighty and Majestic revealed the angels and entrusted them with his order, informing them that He was with them. He ordered them to assist the Prophet and the believers. Then the Prophet took a handful of pebbles and threw them in the faces of the polytheists. God brought about the pebbles in a mighty way so that not one of the polytheists was not struck in his eyes. The Muslims began to kill, and God and His angels were with them, killing and causing the capture of the enemy. They found that every man among the army was afflicted on his face, for no one	Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī from 'Abd Allāh b. Tha'laba b. Ṣu'ayr al-'Udhri, an ally of Banū Zuhra, told me that when the armies met and drew near to one another, Abū Jahl b. Hishām said, "O God, whichever of us has cut the ties of kinship and has committed what is not approved of, destroy him today." Thus he asked God for victory against himself.  Then the Prophet took a handful of gravel, faced Quraysh, and said, "May their faces be deformed!" Then he threw it at them and ordered his companions and said, "Attack!" There was a rout, and God killed many of the leaders of Quraysh and made captive many of their chiefs.

<sup>549</sup> For Ibn Ishāq's inclusion of *asbāb al-nuzūl*, see page 141 of the present study.

<sup>550</sup> Although both versions allude to Q. 8:17, Mūsā-v is more obviously connected to the verse. Elsewhere another Qur'ānic connection is made, as the narrative in Mūsā-v makes clear: "God said and sent down, 'Do not be as those who set out from their homes boastfully to be seen of men.' This and the following verse referred to the men from the polytheists who were invited to Islam. The polytheists set out with repugnance when they knew of the fewness of Muḥammad and his companions. These [people] disgraced their religion. God said, 'Whoever puts his trust in God, for God is Almighty, All-wise.'" Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:111.

<sup>551</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>552</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:628.

<p>knew where to turn his face which had been covered with dirt so as to remove it from his eyes.</p>	
<p>وقال أبو جهل اللهم انصر خير الدينين، اللهم ديننا القديم، ودين محمد الحديث، ونكص الشيطان على عقبيه حين رأى الملائكة، وتبرأ من نصر أصحابه، فأوحى الله عز وجل إلى الملائكة وأمرهم بأمره وحدثهم أنه معهم، وأمر بنصر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والمؤمنين وأخذ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ملء كفه من الحصباء فرمى بها وجوه المشركين فجعل الله تلك الحصباء عظيماً شأنها لم تترك من المشركين رجلاً إلا ملأت عينيه، وجعل المسلمون بهم قتلاً معهم الله والملائكة يقتلونهم ويأسرونهم ويجدون النفر كل رجل منهم منكباً على وجهه، لا يدري أين يتوجه يعالج التراب ينزعه من عينيه.</p>	<p>وحدثني محمد بن مسلم بن شهاب الزهري، عن عبد الله بن ثعلبة بن صعير العذري، حليف بني زهرة، أنه حدثه: أنه لما التقى الناس، ودنا بعضهم من بعض، قال أبو جهل بن هشام: اللهم أقطعنا للرحم، وأتانا بما لا يعرف، فأحنه الغداة فكان هو المستفتح. ثم إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أخذ حفنة من الحصباء، فاستقبل قريشاً بها، ثم قال: شأهت الوجوه، ثم نفحهم بها، وأمر أصحابه، فقال: شدوا، فكانت الهزيمة، فقتل الله تعالى من قتل من صناديد قريش، وأسر من أسر من أسرافهم.</p>

Another divergence in the storyline's presentation involves the story of Ibn

Mas'ūd's slaying of Abū Jahl:

<p>Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>553</sup></p> <p>The Prophet went on and halted among the slain. A search for Abū Jahl was made but he was unable to be found. When that was made known to the Prophet's face, he said, "O God, may Pharaoh not escape me and this <i>umma</i>." The men proceeded, and 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd found him, fallen and small in stature, between him and the battlefield. He was masked in iron, and his sword was unsheathed on his legs. He was not wounded but was unable to move a limb, and his shoulder faced the ground. When 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd saw him, he circled his location, preparing to attack but afraid of arousing him. Abū Jahl was masked in iron. As 'Abd Allāh called out to him, he noticed that Abū Jahl was not moving. 'Abd Allāh supposed that Abū Jahl was immobile from being wounded. He purposed to strike him with his sword but suspected that he would have no need for it. He approached from behind and stood, unsheathing his sword. Abū Jahl was on his side not moving. 'Abd Allāh lifted the white garment on the back of his neck and struck it. Then he held Abū Jahl's head in his hands and seized it. He had</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>554</sup></p> <p>Then Mu'awwidh b. 'Afrā' passed by Abū Jahl who was wounded, and struck him, leaving him at his last gasp. Then Mu'awwidh fought until he was killed. 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd passed by Abū Jahl when the Prophet had ordered that he should be searched for among the slain. The Prophet had said to them, according to what was told to me, "If he is hidden among the dead, then look for the mark of a wound on his knee." For I had jostled against him at a banquet of 'Abd Allāh b. Jud'ān when we were both young. I was thinner than he was by a little. When I pushed him, he fell on his knees and scratched one of them, the scar of which remains. 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd said, "I found him at his last gasp and recognized him and put my foot on his neck—He [Ibn Mas'ūd] said: He had once seized me in Mecca and had hurt me and punched me—Then I said to him, "Has God put you to shame, O enemy of God?" He replied, "How has he shamed me? Am I anything more important than a man you have killed? Tell me, to whom is the victory today? He [Ibn Mas'ūd] said, "To God and His messenger." Men of Banū Makhzūm</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>553</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:116.

<sup>554</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:635-36.

seen Abū Jahl as though unwounded but now observed on his neck pustules and on his hands and shoulders, the mark of lashes.

Ibn Mas‘ūd came to the Prophet and informed him that Abū Jahl had been slain. Ibn Mas‘ūd also informed him of what was found on Abū Jahl. The Prophet said, “Those were the blows of the angels.” He then said, “O God! You have fulfilled what you promised me.”

assert that Ibn Mas‘ūd used to say: He [Abū Jahl] said to me, “You have ascended a difficult ascent, O little shepherd.” He [Ibn Mas‘ūd] said: Then I cut off his head and brought it to the Prophet, and I said, “O messenger of God, this is the head of the enemy of God, Abū Jahl.” The Prophet replied, “Is it, by God than whom there are no other gods?”— He [Ibn Mas‘ūd] said: This was the oath of the Prophet—He [Ibn Mas‘ūd] said: I said, “Yes, by God than whom there are no other gods.” Then I threw his head in front of the Prophet, and he praised God.

وأقبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى وقف على القتلى فالتمس أبا جهل فلم يجده حتى عرف ذلك في وجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال اللهم لا يعجزني فرعون هذه الأمة، فسعى له الرجال حتى وجده عبد الله بن مسعود مصروعا بينه وبين المعركة غير كبير، مقتعا في الحديد واضعا سيفه على فخذه ليس به جرح ولا يستطيع أن يحرك منه عضوا وهو منكب ينظر إلى الأرض. فلما رآه عبد الله بن مسعود أطاف حوله ليقتله وهو خائف أن يثور إليه وأبو جهل مقتع في الحديد، فلما دنا منه وأبصره لا يتحرك ظن عبد الله أن أبا جهل مثبت جراحا فأراد أن يضربه بسيفه فخشى أن لا يغني سيفه شيئا فأتاه من ورائه فتناول قائم سيفه فاستله وهو منكب لا يتحرك، فرفع عبد الله سابعة البيضة عن قفاه فضربه، فوقع رأسه بين يديه ثم سلبه، فلما نظر إليه إذا هو ليس به جراح وأبصر في عنقه جدرا وفي يديه وفي كتفيه كهينة آثار السياط. وأتى ابن مسعود النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فأخبره أن أبا جهل قد قتل وأخبره بالذي وجد به فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: ذلك ضرب الملائكة، وقال: اللهم قد أنجزت ما وعدتني.

ثم مرّ بأبي جهل وهو عقير، معوذ بن عفراء، فضربه حتى أثبتته، فتركه وبه رمق. وقاتل معوذ حتى قتل، فمرّ عبد الله بن مسعود بأبي جهل، حين أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يلتمس في القتلى، وقد قال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم — فيما بلغني — انظروا، إن خفى عليكم في القتلى، إلى أثر جرح في ركبته، فإني ازدحمت يوما أنا وهو على مائدة لعبد الله بن جدعان، ونحن غلامان، وكنت أشف منه ببسير فدفعته، فوقع على ركبتيه، فجحش في إحداهما جحشا لم يزل أثره به. قال عبد الله بن مسعود: فوجدته بأخر رمق، فعرفته، فوضعت رجلى على عنقه — قال: وقد كان ضيبت بي مرّة بمكة، فأذاني ولكزني، ثم قلت له: هل أخزأك الله يا عدو الله؟ قال: وبماذا أخزاني، أعمد من رجل قتلتموه، أخبرني لمن الدائرة اليوم؟ قال: قلت: لله ولرسوله. وزعم رجال من بني مخزوم، أن ابن مسعود كان يقول: قال لي: لقد ارتقيت مرتقى صعبا يا رويعي الغنم، قال: ثم احتزرت رأسه، ثم جئت به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقلت: يا رسول الله، هذا رأس عدو الله أبي جهل، قال: فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: آ الله الذي لا إله غيره — قال: وكانت يمين رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم — قال: قلت نعم، والله الذي لا إله غيره، ثم ألقيت رأسه بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فحمد الله.

In this instance however, not only does the storyline’s presentation diverge, but also the narratives conflict with one another. Whereas in Ibn Ishāq, Mu‘awwidh, the son of ‘Afrā’, administered a blow to Abū Jahl, Mūsā-v denies any wound dealt except those by angels. Moreover it may be significant that Ibn Ishāq’s version involves in the downfall of Abū Jahl the participation of both Mu‘awwidh and Ibn Mas‘ūd. It is possible that his

version had undergone development, for according to a different report, Abū Jahl's slayer was not Ibn Mas'ūd but both sons of 'Afrā':<sup>555</sup>

Musaddad—Yūsuf b. al-Mājishūn—Ṣāliḥ b. Ibrāhīm—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf—his father—his grandfather: While I was standing in the ranks on the day of Badr, I looked to my right and my left when suddenly I was between two young Anṣārī boys. . . I was not delayed in seeing Abū Jahl going about the people. I said, "So this is the man you asked me about." They both attacked him with their swords and struck him until they killed him. Then they went to the Prophet and gave him the news. The Prophet asked, "Which of you killed him?" Each of them said, "I killed him." The Prophet asked, "Did you cleaned your swords?" They answered, "No." Then he looked at their swords and said, "Both of you killed him and his spoils go to Mu'ādh b. 'Amr b. al-Jamūḥ." The two were Mu'ādh b. 'Afrā' and Mu'ādh b. 'Amr b. al-Jamūḥ.

It may be that Ibn Ishāq's desire to include these two sons (in addition to Ibn Mas'ūd) resulted in his alteration of the storyline so that all three played a role in the killing of Abū Jahl. The story would reach a final level of development in the work of al-Wāqidī. According to his report, Mu'ādh, Mu'awwidh and Ibn Mas'ūd are joined by a fourth entity, angels:

The Prophet stood where the two sons of 'Afrā' had died and said, "God bless the two sons of 'Afrā', for they were partners in the killing of the Pharaoh of this *umma*, the head leader of the unbelievers." He [Muḥammad] was asked, "O messenger of God, who killed him along with them?" He replied, "The angels; also Ibn Mas'ūd killed him. Each one shared in his killing."<sup>556</sup>

Other kinds of variations between the version of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā are contradictions and plot divergences. A contradiction is as plain as the number in Abū Sufyān's caravan. While Mūsā-v reports that the caravan consisted of "seventy riders from the core of Quraysh," Ibn Ishāq has it as "thirty or forty men."<sup>557</sup> In the same passage, Mūsā-v has Ḥuwwayṭib remaining in Mecca and not participating at Badr. In Ibn Ishāq however, the only Meccan who stayed behind was the chief Abū Lahab:

<sup>555</sup> Al-Bukhārī, *Al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 2:286.

<sup>556</sup> Al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:91.

<sup>557</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:102; Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:606. It seems more feasible that Muḥammad would amass some three hundred men to confront seventy rather than thirty or forty men. In addition, Mūsā-v reports that the caravan consisted of one thousand camels.

<p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>558</sup></p> <p>The Prophet stayed for two months after the killing of Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī. Then Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb set out from Syria with the caravan of Quraysh. With him were seventy riders from the core of Quraysh, and with them were Makhrama b. Nawfal and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, merchants of Syria, and the wealth of the people of Mecca; it is said that their caravan consisted of a thousand camels. Not one person of Quraysh had not sent at least a small amount with Abū Sufyān, except for Ḥuwwayṭib b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzza who as a result stayed behind and did not participate at Badr. They [The caravan et al.] were reported to the Prophet and his companions. Prior to that, a state of war existed between them, and the killing of Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī and the capture of two men, ‘Uthmān and al-Ḥakim, had taken place.</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>559</sup></p> <p>Then the Prophet heard that Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb was coming from Syria in a large caravan of Quraysh, containing their money and merchandise and including thirty or forty men, of whom were Makhrama b. Nawfal b. Uhayb b. ‘Abd Manāf b. Zuhra, and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ b. Wā’il b. Hishām. . . .</p> <p>The people prepared quickly, saying, “Do Muḥammad and his companions think that it will be like the caravan of Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī? No by God, they will find that it is not.” They were in two groups; some set out themselves and others sent another man in their place. Quraysh went out altogether, and not one of their chiefs stayed behind except for Abū Lahab b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who remained and sent in his place al-‘Āṣ b. Hishām b. al-Mughīra who owed him four thousand dirhams which he was unable to pay. So he [Abū Lahab] hired him in the place of repayment and sent him off. Thus he [al-‘Āṣ] went in his place and Abū Lahab stayed behind.</p>
<p>فمكث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعد قتل ابن الحضرمي شهرين، ثم أقبل أبو سفيان بن حرب في غير قريش من الشام ومعه سبعون راكبا من بطون قريش كلها، وفيهم: مخزومة بن نوفل، وعمرو بن العاص، وكانوا تجارا بالشام ومعهم خزائن أهل مكة، ويقال: كانت غيرهم ألف بعير، ولم يكن لأحد من قريش أوقية فما فوقها إلا بعث بها مع أبي سفيان، إلا حويطب بن عبد العزى، فلذلك كان تخلف عن بدر فلم يشهده، فذكروا لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه وقد كانت الحرب بينهم قبل ذلك وقتل ابن الحضرمي، وأسر الرجلين: عثمان، والحكم.</p>	<p>ثم إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سمع بأبي سفيان بن حرب مقبلا من الشام في غير لقريش عظيمة، فيها أموال لقريش، وتجارة من تجاراتهم، وفيها ثلاثون رجلا من قريش أو أربعون، منهم: مخزومة بن نوفل بن أهبب بن عبد مناف بن زهرة، وعمرو بن العاص بن وائل بن هشام. . . .</p> <p>فتجهز الناس سراعا، وقالوا: أبطن محمد وأصحابه أن تكون كعير ابن الحضرمي، كلا والله ليعلمن غير ذلك. فكانوا بين رجلين، إما خارج، وإما باعث مكانه رجلا. وأوعبت قريش، فلم يتخلف من أشرافها أحد. إلا أن أبا لهب بن عبد المطلب تخلف، وبعث مكانه العاص بن هشام بن المغيرة، وكان قد لاط له بأربعة آلاف درهم كانت له عليه، أفلس بها، فاستأجره بها، على أن يجزي عنه، بعثه فخرج عنه، وتخلف أبو لهب.</p>

A variation in which the plot is affected is found in the report in which Muḥammad sent ‘Adī and Basbas to search for the caravan. In Mūsā-v, the two spies were sent from Medina after Muḥammad initially received word of the caravan. It is upon their return that Muḥammad summoned the Muslims to raid the caravan. In Ibn

<sup>558</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:102.

<sup>559</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:606, 609-10.

Ishāq however, ‘Adī and Basbas were dispatched from a location *other* than Medina *after* the Muslims had set out against the caravan:

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>560</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>561</sup>
When news of Abū Sufyān’s caravan was told to the Prophet, he dispatched ‘Adī b. Abī al-Zaghbā’, an Anṣārī of Banū Ghanim of the lineage of Juhayna, and Basbas, i.e. Ibn ‘Amr, to search for it. The two set out until they reached the tribe of Juhayna near the coast. When they asked about the caravan and the merchants of Quraysh, the people provided them with the information. They returned to the Prophet and reported the news to him. Then the Prophet called upon the Muslims to raid the caravan. And that was in Ramaḍān.	The Prophet set out in the month of Ramaḍān with his companions. . . When he was near al-Ṣafrā’ he sent Basbas b. [‘Amr] al-Juhanī, an ally of Banū Sā’ida, and ‘Adīy b. Abī Zaghbā’ al-Juhanī, ally of Banū al-Najjār, to Badr to seek out news about Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb and his caravan.
فلما ذكرت عير أبي سفيان لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عدي بن أبي الزغباء الأنصاري من بني غنم، وأصله من جهينة وبسبس يعني ابن عمرو إلى العير عينا له، فسارا حتى أتيا حيا من جهينة قريبا من ساحل البحر، فسألوه عن العير وعن تجار قريش، فأخبروهما بخبر القوم فرجعا إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فأخبراه فاستنقرا المسلمين للعير، وذلك في رمضان.	وخرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في ليال مضت من شهر رمضان في أصحابه. . . إذا كان قريبا من الصفراء، بعث بسبس بن الجهني، حليف بني ساعدة، وعدي بن أبي الزغباء الجهني، حليف بني النجار، إلى بدر يتحسسان له الأخبار، عن أبي سفيان بن حرب وغيره.

Only in Mūsā-v does the spies’ report bring about the Muslims’ departure from Medina.

In Ibn Ishāq’s version however, the Muslims set out on the basis of an altogether different report. The reporter is unidentified; the narrative simply asserts that

Muḥammad heard about the caravan: “When the Prophet heard about Abū Sufyān coming from Syria, he summoned the Muslims.”<sup>562</sup>

Another plot divergence involves the event that prompted Abū Sufyān to send Ḍamḍam to Mecca for help. In Mūsā-v, Abū Sufyān dispatched Ḍamḍam upon learning of the spies ‘Adī and Basbas:<sup>563</sup>

<sup>560</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:102.

<sup>561</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:612-14.

<sup>562</sup> *Ibid.*, 606-7.

<sup>563</sup> Ibn Ishāq’s version is provided to show that Abū Sufyān did not dispatch Ḍamḍam upon discovering the spies. Concerning the coproscopy, Wansbrough suspects that it was intentionally inserted for the purpose of adding color. Wansbrough, *Sectarian Milieu*, 39.

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>564</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>565</sup>
<p>Fearful of the Prophet and his companions, Abū Sufyān approached the people of al-Juhayna and asked, “Has anyone taken notice of Muḥammad?” They told him news of the two riders, ‘Adī b. Abī al-Zaghbā’ and Basbas, and showed him the place where they had halted. Abū Sufyān said, “Retrieve the dung of their camels.” Then he broke it open and found date-stones. He said, “This is the fodder of the people of Yathrib, and here were the spies of Muḥammad and his companions.” So they left quickly, frightened of the pursuit. Abū Sufyān dispatched a man from Banū Ghifār, said to have been Ḍamḍam b. ‘Amr, to Quraysh, saying, “Hurry and defend your caravan from Muḥammad and his companions. He has called his men out to attack us.”</p>	<p>Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb proceeded ahead of the caravan as a precaution until he arrived at the water. He asked Majdī b. ‘Amr, “Have you noticed anyone?” He replied, “I have not seen anyone I do not know; however I saw two riders halt on this hill, fill their water skins, and leave.” Abū Sufyān went to their halting place, picked up some of the camel dung, and crumbled it. It contained date-stones. He said, “By God, this is the fodder of Yathrib.” He returned hastily to his companions and turned his caravan’s direction away from the road and towards the coast, leaving Badr on the left. He departed quickly.</p>
<p>واقبل أبو سفيان بن حرب، حتى تقدم العير حذرا، حتى ورد الماء، فقال لمجدى بن عمرو: هل أحسست أحدا، فقال: ما رأيت أحدا أنكره، إلا أنى قد رأيت راكبين قد أناخا إلى هذا التلّ، ثم استقيا في شئ لهما، ثم انطلقا. فأتى أبو سفيان مناخهما، فأخذ من أبعار بعيريهما، ففتته، فإذا فيه النوى، فقال: هذه والله علائف يثرب. فرجع إلى أصحابه سريعا، فضرب وجهه عيره عن الطريق، فساحل بها، وترك بدرا ببسار، وانطلق حتى أسرع.</p> <p>وقدم أبو سفيان على الجهنيين وهو متخوف من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه فقال: أحسوا من محمد، فأخبروه خبر الراكبين: عدي بن أبي الزغباء، وبسبس، وأشاروا إلى مناخهما، فقال أبو سفيان: خذوا من بعر بعيريهما، ففتته، فوجد فيه النوى، فقال: هذه علائف أهل يثرب، وهذه عيون محمد وأصحابه، فساروا سراعا خائفين للطلب، وبعث أبو سفيان رجلا من بني غفار يقال له: ضمضم بن عمرو، إلى قریش: أن انفرول فاحموا عيركم من محمد وأصحابه، فإنه قد استنفر أصحابه ليعرضوا لنا.</p>	

In Ibn Ishāq however, Abū Sufyān had not yet learned of the spies. He instead dispatched Ḍamḍam much earlier upon receiving news about Muḥammad’s advance from a different source, “some riders”:

When the Prophet heard that Abū Sufyān was coming from Syria, he summoned the Muslims to go against them, saying, “This is caravan of Quraysh caravan within which is their wealth. Go out against it; perhaps God will give it to you as booty.” The people answered his summons, some eagerly, others reluctantly because they had not thought that the Prophet would go to war. Abū Sufyān had been seeking information and questioning the riders whom he met as he approached the Ḥijāz, being afraid of a grievous thing for the people. Then he received news from some riders: “Muḥammad has called out his companions against you and your caravan.” He was on his guard at that, and he hired Ḍamḍam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī and sent him to Mecca, ordering him to go to Quraysh and seek

<sup>564</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103.

<sup>565</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:618.

aid of them for their property, and to tell them that Muḥammad had set out against the caravan with his companions. So ḌamḌam left quickly to Mecca.<sup>566</sup>

The account in *Mūsā-v* is problematic. The storyline from the beginning of the Badr narrative to the night before the battle reflects an impossible sequence of events. At the start, Abū Sufyān when learning of the spies sent by Muḥammad dispatched ḌamḌam to Mecca for assistance; thereupon Quraysh marched to Badr. Since ḌamḌam's journey to Mecca took two to three days,<sup>567</sup> and the journey of Quraysh to Badr required approximately three days,<sup>568</sup> the length of time between the dispatch of ḌamḌam and the arrival of Quraysh to Badr was five to six days.

*Mūsā-v* does not say precisely when Muḥammad, upon hearing the spies' report, set out to Badr. If he set out on the same or next day of the spies' report—which would be the reasonable course of action—then his journey from Medina to Badr would have taken an unusually long five or six days. This is an implausible scenario seeing as a journey's time between Medina and Badr is one or two days. Thus the story would make sense if Muḥammad had set out approximately five days after hearing the spies' report. But not only is it dubious that a raid on a moving caravan would wait a delay of five days, but also Abū Sufyān would have safely arrived at his destination of Mecca within those five days. Hence this scenario is also implausible. The final possible scenario is one in which two or three days elapsed both before Muḥammad set out and for the journey to Badr itself. This final scenario which contains the least shortcomings nevertheless depicts an awkward and unrealistic sequence of events, for it portrays the

---

<sup>566</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:606-7.

<sup>567</sup> 'Ātika's vision in which "two or three nights" is mentioned is supportive of this estimation. Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:103-5.

<sup>568</sup> *Ibid.*, 109-10.

Muslims as an incompetent people, exceedingly slow at both organizing themselves and moving to a neighboring town.<sup>569</sup>

Another divergence in plot has to do with the Muslims' capture and interrogation of two slaves of Quraysh. In *Mūsā-v*, the Muslims were unaware of Quraysh's advance when they interrogated the slaves. As a result, when the slaves informed them of Quraysh, the Muslims *believed* that the slaves were lying. In Ibn Ishāq however, the Muslims did not believe but *hoped* that the slaves were lying. For Ibn Ishāq's preceding storyline in at least two places had established that the Muslims were aware of Quraysh's advance. In the first place, the council of war had been convened, since "news came to him [Muḥammad] that Quraysh had set out to protect their caravan."<sup>570</sup> Secondly, Muḥammad had questioned an old Bedouin who in response precisely pointed out Quraysh's location.<sup>571</sup> A comparison of the versions reveals the difference in plot:

Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>572</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>573</sup>
The Prophet proceeded until evening, drawing a little closer to Badr. He dispatched 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām and Basbas al-Anṣārī of Banū Sā'ida who was also one of the Juhayna from among the troop of the Prophet's companions. He said to them, "Hasten to these small mountains, for he [Abū Sufyān] is in the vicinity of Badr. I hope you find good favor at the well that is near the small mountains." Armed with swords, they departed and found the watering place of Quraysh at the well mentioned by the Prophet. Then they seized two slaves, one of whom was black and belonged to Banū al-Ḥajjāj and the other belonged to the people of al-'Āṣ. It is said of the latter that he converted to	Then the Prophet returned to his companions. When evening came, he sent 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām and Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ with a few of his companions to the water of Badr to seek out news, according to what Yazīd b. Rūmān from 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr told me. They came upon water-carriers of Quraysh, among whom were Aslam, a slave of Banū al-Ḥajjāj, and 'Arīḍ Abū Yasār, a slave of Banū al-'Āṣ b. Sa'īd, and they brought them along and questioned them while the Prophet was standing in prayer. They said, "We are water-carriers of Quraysh; they sent us to get them water." The people were displeased at their report, for they had hoped that they belonged to Abū Sufyān, so they

<sup>569</sup> This problematic account in *Mūsā-v* is also found in 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr's alleged letter to the caliph 'Abd al-Malik. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 3:1284-88. It seems plausible that Ibn Ishāq noticed these difficulties within the story and consequently made alterations in the formation of a more coherent narrative.

<sup>570</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:614-15.

<sup>571</sup> *Ibid.*, 615-16.

<sup>572</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:108.

<sup>573</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:616.

<p>Islam. The slaves' companions escaped towards Quraysh. The spies moved along and brought the two slaves to the Prophet who had been in his hut without water. They began to ask the slaves about Abū Sufyān and his companions not considering but that they were not with them [Abū Sufyān's party]. The slaves began to tell them about Quraysh and who among them had come out, and about their leaders. They [The Muslims] lied to the slaves, for they found what the slaves told them to be a displeasing thing. For they were expecting [information about] Abū Sufyān and his companions and were displeased with [that of] Quraysh.<sup>574</sup></p>	<p>beat them. When they had caused them distress, the slaves said, "We belong to Abū Sufyān." Then they let them go.</p>
<p>وسار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى نزل أدنى شيء من بدر عشاء، ثم بعث علي بن أبي طالب، والزبير بن العوام وبسبب الأنصاري عديد بني ساعدة، وهو أحد جهينة في عصابة من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال لهم: اندفعوا إلى هذه الطراب وهو في ناحية بدر، فإني أرجو أن تجدوا الخير عند القلب الذي يلي الطراب، فانطلقوا متوشحي السيوف فوجدوا وارد قريش عند القلب الذي ذكر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأخذوا غلامين أحدهما لبني الحجاج أسود والآخر لآل العاص يقال له أسلم، وأفلت أصحابهما قبل قريش فأقبلوا بهما حتى أتوا بهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو في معرّسه دون الماء فجعلوا يسألون العبيد عن أبي سفيان وأصحابه لا يرون إلا أنهما لهم، فطفقا يحدثانهم عن قريش ومن خرج منهم وعن رؤوسهم فيكذبونهما وهم أكره شيء للذي يخبرانهم وكانوا يطمعون بأبي سفيان وأصحابه ويكرهون قريشا.</p>	<p>ثم رجع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى أصحابه، فلما أمسى بعث علي بن أبي طالب، والزبير بن العوام، وسعد بن أبي وقاص، في نفر من أصحابه، إلى ماء بدر، يلتمسون الخبر له عليه – كما حدثني يزيد بن رومان، عن عروة بن الزبير – فأصابوا راوية لقريش فيها أسلم، غلام بنى الحجاج، وعريض أبو يسار، غلام بنى العاص بن سعيد، فأتوا بهما، فسألوهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قائم يصلى، فقالا: نحن سقاة قريش، بعثونا نسقيهم من الماء. فكره القوم خبرهما، ورجوا أن يكونا لأبي سفيان، فضربوهما. فلما أدلفوهما قالوا: نحن لأبي سفيان، فتركوهما.</p>

Further examination of the work of Ibn Ishāq reveals that his version had undergone alteration. According to Ibn Ishāq, the interrogation story which goes back to 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr nowhere mentions the Muslims' unawareness that Quraysh had set out to intercept them. In 'Urwa's alleged letter to the caliph 'Abd al-Malik however, the Muslims' unawareness of Quraysh is explicitly mentioned. A side-by-side comparison shows the difference between the versions:

<sup>574</sup> Q. 8:42a is incorporated later in the report, which as a result functions as the verse's circumstance of revelation: ". . . When the slaves were beaten, they were made to say, 'Yes, this is Abū Sufyān and the caravan.' According to God's word: 'When you were on the nearer bank, and they were on the farther bank, and the caravan was below you; if you had made an appointment, then you would have broken the appointment, but that God might determine a matter that was done.'"

<p>‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (via al-Ṭabarī)<sup>575</sup></p> <p>The Prophet marched forward and alighted near Badr. He sent al-Zubayr al-‘Awwām with a group of his companions to the water of Badr. They did not suppose that Quraysh had come out against them, but while the Prophet was standing in prayer, some water-carriers of Quraysh suddenly came to the water of Badr. Among the water-carriers who came was a black slave of Banū al-Ḥajjāj. The men whom the Prophet had sent with al-Zubayr to the water seized him, but some of the slave’s companions escaped towards Quraysh. They brought him along until they came to the Prophet in his shelter and questioned him about Abū Sufyān and his companions, supposing that he was with them. The slave began to tell them about Quraysh and who among them had come out and about their leaders. He gave a report that was true, but the report that he gave was a displeasing thing to them, for they sought at that time the caravan of Abū Sufyān and his companions. As the Prophet was kneeling down and bowing in worship, he saw and heard what was being done to the slave. When he [the slave] told them that Quraysh had come out against them, they began to beat him and call him a liar, saying, “You are concealing from us Abū Sufyān and his companions.” When they beat him severely and asked him about Abū Sufyān and his companions, although he had no knowledge about them and was of the water-carriers of Quraysh, he said, “Yes, this is Abū Sufyān.”</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>576</sup></p> <p>Then the Prophet returned to his companions. When evening came, he sent ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām and Sa’d b. Abī Waqqāṣ with a few of his companions to the water of Badr to seek out news, according to what Yazīd b. Rūmān from ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr told me. They came upon water-carriers of Quraysh, among whom were Aslam, a slave of Banū al-Ḥajjāj, and ‘Arīḍ Abū Yasār, a slave of Banū al-‘Āṣ b. Sa’īd, and they brought them along and questioned them while the Prophet was standing in prayer. They said, “We are water-carriers of Quraysh; they sent us to get them water.” The people were displeased at their report, for they had hoped that they belonged to Abū Sufyān, so they beat them. When they had caused them distress, the slaves said, “We belong to Abū Sufyān.” Then they let them go.</p>
<p>وسار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى عرس قريبا من بدر وبعث النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الزبير بن العوام في عصابة من أصحابه إلى ماء بدر وليسوا يحسبون أن قريشا خرجت لهم فبينما النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قائم يصلي إذ ورد بعض روايا قريش ماء بدر وفيمن ورد من الروايا غلام لبني الحجاج اسود فأخذه نفر الذين بعثهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم مع الزبير إلى الماء وافلت بعض أصحاب العبد نحو قريش فاقبلوا به حتى اتوا به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو في معرسه فسألوه عن أبي سفيان وأصحابه لا</p>	<p>ثم رجع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى أصحابه، فلما أمسى بعث علي بن أبي طالب، والزبير بن العوام، وسعد بن أبي وقاص، في نفر من أصحابه، إلى ماء بدر، يلتمسون الخبر له عليه – كما حدثني يزيد بن رومان، عن عروة بن الزبير – فأصابوا راوية لقريش فيها أسلم، غلام بني الحجاج، وعريض أبو يسار، غلام بني العاص بن سعيد، فأتوا بهما، فسألوهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قائم يصلي، فقالا: نحن سقاة قريش، بعثونا نسقيهم من الماء فكره القوم خبرهما، ورجوا أن يكونا لأبي سفيان، فضربوهما. فلما</p>

<sup>575</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1286-87.

<sup>576</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:616.

<p>يحبسون إلا أنه معهم فطفق العبد يحدثهم عن قريش ومن خرج منها وعن رؤوسهم ويصدقهم الخير وهم أكره شيء إليهم الخير الذي يخبرهم وإنما يطلبون حينئذ بالركب أبا سفيان وأصحابه والنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يصلى يركع ويسجد يرى ويسمع ما يصنع بالعبد فطفقوا إذا ذكر لهم أنها قريش جاءتهم ضربوه وكذبوه وقالوا إنما تكتننا أبا سفيان وأصحابه فجعل العبد إذا أذنقوه بالضرب وسألوه عن أبي سفيان وأصحابه وليس له بهم علم إنما هو من روايا قريش قال نعم هذا أبو سفيان.</p>	<p>أذلقوهما قالاً: نحن لأبي سفيان، فتركوهما.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

Ibn Ishāq made the omission as a reconstruction, since as earlier mentioned, his preceding storyline in two locations established that the Muslims were aware of Quraysh's advance.

The next two variations have to do with chronology. The first one concerns the Meccans' dispatch of 'Umayr b. Wahb to discover the number of the Muslim force. Whereas in Mūsā-v, 'Umayr was sent after a heated interaction between 'Utba and Abū Jahl, in Ibn Ishāq, the dispatch took place prior to the interaction. In fact 'Umayr's report upon his mission's return serves as the event that eventually brought about the transactions between 'Utba and Abū Jahl. Also worthy of notice is that Mūsā-v includes an attack by 'Umayr against the Muslims. This attack is not present in Ibn Ishāq's version:

<p>Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>577</sup> The polytheists advanced until they descended and were too weary for battle. With them was Satan who did not withdraw from them. Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām headed over to 'Utba b. Rabī'a and asked, "Are you not the established chief of Quraysh?" 'Utba answered, "What have I done?" Ḥakīm said, "You have wronged the people, for you are responsible for the blood money of Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī and for what Muḥammad has done to that caravan. However they [Quraysh] do not demand of Muḥammad but this caravan and the blood of this man [Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī]" . . . Quraysh assembled for battle, and</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>578</sup> My father, Ishāq b. Yasār, and other scholars, from some elders of the Anṣār, told me: When the enemy had settled down, they sent 'Umayr b. Wahb al-Jumahī, saying, "Estimate for us the number of Muḥammad's men." So he circled the camp on his horse and then returned to them, saying, "Three hundred men, give or take a little; but wait until I see if they have men lying in ambush or reserves." He [Ibn Ishāq] said: He rode far into the valley but did not see anything. Then he returned to them and said, "I did not find anything, but I saw, O people of Quraysh, camels carrying death, the water-camels of Yathrib</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>577</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:111-13.

<sup>578</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:622-23.

'Utba said to Abū Jahl, "You will know this day whose lungs are swollen. I am rightly guided in my affairs." Quraysh gathered their ranks for battle and said to 'Umayr b. Wahb, "Set out and estimate for us the number of Muḥammad and his companions." Then 'Umayr saddled his horse and circled the Prophet and his companions. He returned to the polytheists and said, "I counted three hundred fighters, more or less some, and approximately seventy camels, but I was delayed in seeing what they had as reinforcements or hidden forces." Then he circled their location with cavalry sent with him by Quraysh. After they circled the location of the Prophet and his companions, they returned and said, "There are neither reinforcements nor hidden forces. And they are the eaters of one slaughtered camel as their meal."

They [Quraysh] said to 'Umayr, "Sow discord among the enemy." He then made an attack against the ranks, and they returned with a hundred horses.

carrying certain death. The men have no refuge or retreat except their swords. By God, I do not think that a man of them will be killed until he has killed one of you, and if they kill of you the same number as their own, what is the benefit of living after that? Decide as you see fit." When Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām heard that, he went on foot among the people and came to 'Utba b. Rabī'a . . . Then 'Utba b. Rabī'a arose to speak and said, "O people of Quraysh, by God you will not gain anything by meeting Muḥammad and his companions. By God, if you fall upon him, no man will look upon the face of another man except with disgust for killing the son of his paternal or maternal uncle or a man of his clan. Go back, and let the rest of the Arabs have their way with Muḥammad. If they kill him, that is what you want, and if not, he will find that you have not done to him what you would have liked to have done." . . .

He [Abū Jahl] said, "By God, his lungs swelled with fear when he saw Muḥammad and his companions. No by God, we will not go back until God decides between us and Muḥammad. What 'Utba has said is meaningless to himself, but he had seen that Muḥammad and his companions are [few in number as] the eaters of one slaughtered camel. His son is among them, and he is fearful of you for his sake."

أقبل المشركون حتى نزلوا وتعبوا للقتال والشيطان معهم لا يفارقهم، فسعى حكيم بن حزام إلى عتبة بن ربيعة فقال: هل لك أن تكون سيد قريش ما عشت؟ قال عتبة: فأفعل ماذا؟ قال تجير بين الناس وتحمل دية ابن الحضرمي وبما أصاب محمد من تلك العير، فإنهم لا يطلبون من محمد غير هذه العير، ودم هذا الرجل. . . .

اجتمعت قريش على القتال وقال عتبة لأبي جهل ستعلم اليوم من انتفخ سحره أي الأمرين أرشد وأخذت قريش مصافها للقتال وقالوا لعمر بن وهب: اركب فاحزر لنا محمدا وأصحابه، فقعد عمير على فرسه فأطاف برسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه، ثم رجع إلى المشركين فقال حزرتهم بثلاثمائة مقاتل زادوا شيئا أو نقصوا شيئا، وحزرت سبعين بعيرا، ونحو ذلك، ولكن أنظروني حتى أنظر هل لهم مدد أو خبيء، فأطاف حولهم وبعثوا خيلهم معه، فأطافوا حول رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه ثم رجعوا فقالوا: لا

وحدثني أبي إسحاق بن يسار وغيره من أهل العلم، عن أشياخ من الأنصار، قالوا: لما اطمأن القوم، بعثوا عمير بن وهب الجمحي، فقالوا: احزروا لنا أصحاب محمد، قال: فاستجال بفرسه حول العسكر، ثم رجع إليهم، فقال: ثلاث مئة رجل، يزيدون قليلا أو ينقصون، ولكن أمهلوني حتى أنظر للقوم كمين أو مدد؟ قال: فضرب في الوادي حتى أبعد، فلم ير شيئا، فرجع إليهم فقال: ما وجدت شيئا، ولكني قد رأيت، يا معشر قريش، البلايا تحمل المنايا، نواضح يثرب تحمل الموت الناقع، قوم ليس معهم منعة ولا ملجأ إلا سيوفهم، والله ما أرى أن يقتل رجل منهم، حتى يقتل رجلا منكم، فإذا أصابوا منكم أعدادهم، فما خير العيش بعد ذلك؟ فروا رأيكم. فلما سمع حكيم بن حزام ذلك مشى في الناس، فأتى عتبة بن ربيعة. . . ثم قام عتبة بن ربيعة خطيبا، فقال: يا معشر قريش، إنكم والله ما تصنعون بأن تلقوا محمدا وأصحابه شيئا، والله لئن أصيبتوه لا يزال الرجل ينظر في وجه رجل يكره النظر إليه، قتل ابن عمه أو

<p>مدد لهم ولا خبيء، وإنما هم أكلة جزور طعام مأكول. وقالوا لعمير حرش بين القوم فحمل عمير على الصّفّ ورجعوا بمائة فارس.</p>	<p>ابن خاله، أو رجلا من عشيرته، فارجعوا واخلوا بين محمد وبين سائر العرب، فإن أصابوه فذاك الذي أردتم، وإن كان غير ذلك أفاكم ولم تعرّضوا منه ما تريدون. . فقال: انتفخ والله سحره حين رأى محمدا وأصحابه، كلاً والله لا نرجع حتى يحكم الله بيننا وبين محمد، وما بعثة ما قال، ولكنه قد رأى أن محمدا وأصحابه أكلة جزور، وفيهم ابنه، فقد تخوّفكم عليه.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The second chronological variation concerns the identity of the first Muslim martyr. The first Muslim to die according to Mūsā-v was ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥammām. According to Ibn Ishāq however, he was Mihja’. It appears that Ibn Ishāq would have ‘Umayr as the third Muslim martyr:

<p>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)<sup>579</sup></p> <p>The Prophet arose among the people and exhorted them, saying that God Most High would award Paradise to those who martyred themselves that day. Then ‘Umayr b. Ḥammām, the brother of Banū Salima, arose, bearing on the ground with clinched hands, before his friends when he heard the words of the Prophet. He asked, “O messenger of God, I will go to Paradise if I am killed?” When the Prophet answered, “Yes,” he charged against the enemies of God. And God Most High martyred him. He was among the slain the first to be killed.</p>	<p>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)<sup>580</sup></p> <p>Mihja’, the <i>mawlā</i> of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was hit by an arrow and was killed. He was the first among the Muslims to be killed. Then while Ḥāritha b. Surāqa, one of Banū ‘Adīy b. al-Najjār, was drinking from the cistern, he was hit by an arrow in the throat and was killed. Then the Prophet went out to the people and incited them saying, “By Him in whose hand is the soul of Muḥammad, no man who fights today who is killed fighting courageously and with resignation, advancing and not retreating, will not be stopped by God from entering Paradise.” ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥammām, the brother of Banū Salima, was eating dates he had in his hand and said, “Excellent! What stands between me and my entering Paradise except that these people kill me?” Then he threw the dates from his hand, took his sword, and fought the enemy until he was killed.</p>
<p>وقام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الناس فوعظهم وأخبرهم أن الله تعالى قد أوجب الجنة لمن استشهد اليوم، فقام عمير بن حمام أخو بني سلمة عن عجين كان يعجنه لأصحابه حين سمع قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال: يا رسول الله إن لي الجنة إن قتلت؟ قال: نعم، فشد على أعداء الله مكانه فاستشهده الله تعالى، وكان أول قتيل قتل.</p>	<p>وقد رمى مهجع، مول عمر بن الخطاب، بسهم فقتل، فكان أول قتيل من المسلمين، ثم رمى حارثة بن سراقة بن سراقة، أحد بني عدى بن النجار، وهو يشرب من الحوض، بسهم، فأصاب نحره، فقتل.<sup>581</sup> ثم خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى الناس فحرّضهم،<sup>582</sup> وقال: والذي نفس محمد بيده، لا يقاتلهم اليوم رجل فيقتل صابرا محتسبا، مقبلا غير</p>

<sup>579</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, 3:113.

<sup>580</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:627.

<sup>581</sup> من الحوض فقتل. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 3:1321.

<sup>582</sup> حرّضهم ونفل كل امرئ منهم ما أصاب. Ibid.

	مدبر، إلا أدخله الله الجنة. فقال عمير بن الحمام، أخو بنى سلمة، وفي يده تمرات يأكلهن: بخ بخ، أما بيني وبين أن أدخل الجنة إلا أن يقتلني هؤلاء، ثم قذف التمرات من يده، وأخذ سيفه، فقاتل القوم حتى قتل.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Albrecht Noth noted the difficulty of assessing *awā'il* (“the first to”) traditions. He acknowledged that although “honor and glory could . . . be tied to the question of ‘who was first?’ there is no lack, in any case, of *awā'il* traditions which may be suspected of bias in this regard.”<sup>583</sup> For Noth, these kinds of reports may have served to enhance the prestige of the descendants and fellow tribesmen of the persons named.

A final variation between the version of Ibn Ishāq and that attributed to Mūsā involves chronology and geography. In the relevant account, the Muslims and Quraysh headed to Badr, and while rain sent by God hardened the road, enabling the Muslims to travel quickly, the same rain softened the road for Quraysh, hindering their advance. Reaching Badr first, the Muslims filled all but one cistern as a result of the advice by al-Ḥubāb.

In Mūsā-v, the setting in which al-Ḥubāb gave his strategic advice to the Muslims involved the time and location in which the interrogation of the water-carriers of Quraysh took place, i.e. *near* Badr, *before* traveling on the hardened road. In Ibn Ishāq however, al-Ḥubāb offered the advice *at* Badr *after* trekking through the rain:

Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) <sup>584</sup>	Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) <sup>585</sup>
The Prophet arose and said, “Advise me concerning the location.” Al-Ḥubāb b. al-Mundhir, a man of the Anṣār and one of Banū Salama, arose and answered, “O messenger of God, I know about it and its wells. If you seek to approach a well from there, you will find that it is full of fresh water, so go to it before the enemy reaches it and dry up the other wells.” Then the Prophet said, “March, for God Most High has promised you one of the	God sent a rain—the <i>wādī</i> -bed was soft—which hardened the ground for the Prophet and his companions and did not hinder them from moving but caused Quraysh to be unable to set out. So the Prophet went forward, hastening his men to the water, and when he got to the nearest well of Badr he halted. I was told that some men of Banū Salama said that al-Ḥubāb b. al-Mundhir b. al-Jamūḥ said, “O messenger of God, do

<sup>583</sup> Albrecht Noth and Lawrence I. Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-Critical Study*, trans. Michael Bonner (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1994), 106.

<sup>584</sup> Al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 3:110.

<sup>585</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:620.

two parties.” He came to the wells, but the people were filled with fear, for weakness was among them due to fear of Satan.

The Prophet and the Muslims advanced, racing to the water. The polytheists also advanced quickly, aiming for the water. That night God caused rain to fall which deeply hindered the polytheists and prevented them from moving. For the Muslims, the rain was light and hardened the road, making it a flat surface upon which to tread. Thus the Muslims arrived first at the water. They arrived towards nighttime and hurried to the well, taking out much of its water. Then they built a large cistern and dried up the other wells. The Prophet said, “This is their destruction, if God Most High wills, this morning.” Then God Mighty and Majestic revealed, “When He brought upon you slumber as a security from Him, he sent to you rain from heaven to purify you, and to remove from you the impurity of Satan, and to strengthen your hearts and steady your feet.”

you consider this place as one that God has revealed to you, so that it is not up to us to advance or withdraw from it, or is it one of judgment, military tactic, and stratagem?” He replied, “Certainly not, it is one of judgment, military tactic, and stratagem.” Then he [al-Ḥubāb] said, “O messenger of God, this is not the right place. Take the men and we will go to the well nearest to the enemy; we will stop there. Then we will fill up the other wells. We will build a cistern and fill it with water. Then we will fight the enemy and will have water to drink while they do not.” The Prophet said, “You have given good advice.” The Prophet and those with him arose and went to the well nearest to the enemy and halted. Then he ordered the other wells to be filled and a cistern to be built at the well where he had halted. It [The cistern] was filled with water. Then they cast their drinking-vessels into it.

فقام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال: أشيروا عليّ في المنزل فقام الحباب بن المنذر رجل من الأنصار ثم أحد بني سلمة، فقال: أنا يا رسول الله عالم بها وبقلبها إن رأيت أن تسير إلى قليب منها قد عرفتها كثيرة الماء عذبة فتنزل عليها وتسبق القوم إليها وتغور ما سواها فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: سيروا فإن الله تعالى قد وعدكم إحدى الطائفتين أنها لكم. فوقع في قلوب الناس كثير الخوف، وكان فيهم شيء من تخاذل من تخويف الشيطان.

فسار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والمسلمون مسابقين إلى الماء وسار المشركون سراعاً يريدون الماء فأنزل الله عليهم في تلك الليلة مطراً واحداً فكان على المشركين بلاء شديداً منعهم أن يسيروا وكان على المسلمين ديمة خفيفة لبد لهم المسير والمنزل وكانت بطحاء دهسة فسبق المسلمون إلى الماء فنزلوا عليه شطر الليل، فاقتحم القوم في القليب فمأحوها حتى كثر مأوها وصنعوا حوضاً عظيماً ثم غوروا ما سواها من المياه. وقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: هذه مصارعهم إن شاء الله تعالى بالغداة، وأنزل الله عز وجل: إذ يغشاكم النعاس أمانة منه وينزل عليكم من السماء ماء ليطهركم به ويذهب عنكم رجز الشيطان وليربط على قلوبكم ويثبت به الأقدام.

وبعث الله السماء، وكان الوادي دهسا، فأصاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه منها ما لبد لهم الأرض، ولم يمنعمهم عن السير، وأصاب قريشاً منها ما لم يقدروا على أن يرتحلوا معه. فخرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يبادرهم إلى الماء، حتى إذا جاء أدنى ماء من بدر نزل به.

فحدثت عن رجال من بني سلمة، أنهم ذكروا: أن الحباب بن المنذر بن الجموح قال: يا رسول الله، أرايت هذا المنزل، أمتزلاً أنزله الله، ليس لنا أن نتفدّمه، ولا نتأخّر عنه، أم هو الرأي والحرب والمكيدة؟ قال: بل هو الرأي والحرب والمكيدة؟ فقال: يا رسول الله، فإن هذا ليس بمنزل، فانهض بالناس حتى نأتى أدنى ماء من القوم، فننزله، ثم نغور ما وراءه من القليب، ثم نبني عليه حوضاً، فنملؤه ماء، ثم نقاتل القوم، فنشرب ولا يشربون، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: لقد أشرت بالرأى. فنهض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومن معه من الناس، فسار حتى إذا أتى أدنى ماء من القوم نزل عليه، ثم أمر بالقلب فغورت، وبنى حوضاً على القليب الذي نزل عليه، فملء ماء، ثم قذفوا فيه الأنية.

An issue of greater significance concerning the advice by al-Ḥubāb and the consequent seizure of the cistern by the Muslims is invention. The account in Mūsā-v and Ibn Ishāq happens to be contradicted by another version of events.<sup>586</sup> The implication is that one of the two versions must have been invented. Before the contradictory account is displayed, two other reports which are connected to the account in Mūsā-v and Ibn Ishāq are presented. One report is provided by al-Kalbī in which Ibn ‘Abbās relates that an angel instructed Muḥammad to follow the suggestion of al-Ḥubāb:

As the Prophet was gathering the men into groups with Gabriel on his right, an angel came to him and said, “O Muḥammad, God greets you with peace.” The Prophet replied, “He is peace, from Him comes peace, and to Him peace goes.” Then the angel said, “God says that you are to do what al-Ḥubāb b. Mundhir instructed you.” The Prophet asked, “O Gabriel, do you know this man?” He replied, “I don’t know all the people of heaven, but he is truthful. He is no devil.” The Prophet and those with him arose and proceeded to the well nearest the army [of Quraysh], and halted. Then he ordered the other wells to be blocked and built a cistern at the well where he had stopped and filled it with water. They then threw the water jugs into it. . . . They halted at the well that was nearest to the polytheists in the middle of the night and made camp there. They filled the cistern with water, and the polytheists had no water.<sup>587</sup>

The other report which is provided by Ibn Ishāq maintains that the Prophet allowed some of Quraysh to drink from the cistern.

When the army encamped, a group of Quraysh, among whom was Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām, went on to the cistern of the Prophet. The Prophet said, “Let them be.” There was not a man who drank of it that day who was not killed, except for Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām. Verily he was not killed. He converted after that and became a good Muslim. When he would give a strong oath, he would say, “No by Him who saved me on the day of Badr.”<sup>588</sup>

Altogether the various accounts form an elaborate narrative that lays out the events following the Muslims’ arrival at Badr the night before the battle: 1) the Muslims reached Badr; 2) al-Ḥubāb advised Muḥammad to take control of the cistern and to fill

<sup>586</sup> Other sources that include the version in Mūsā-v and Ibn Ishāq are: al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:53; and Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, 2:8.

<sup>587</sup> Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 3:267-68. The *isnād* is: The father of al-Umawī—al-Umawī—Abū Ṣāliḥ—Ibn ‘Abbās.

<sup>588</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīra*, 1:622.

the other cisterns; 3) an angel instructed Muḥammad to heed the advice of al-Ḥubāb; 4) Gabriel affirmed the truthfulness of the angel; 4) the Muslims took control of the cistern and stopped up the other cisterns; and 5) Muḥammad permitted some men of Quraysh to drink from the cistern.

The opposing version of this narrative is found in a report attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās. According to the report, it was Quraysh who took control of the cistern. As a result, the Muslims were unable to access the water. Then God sent rain so that the Muslims could drink water and purify themselves. The opposing version of Ibn ‘Abbās is found in the *Tafsīr* of Ibn Kathīr.<sup>589</sup>

‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalḥa from Ibn ‘Abbās said: The Prophet arrived at Badr and made camp. Between the well and the polytheists was a sandy piece of land. The Muslims felt greatly weak, and Satan cast frustration into their hearts, whispering among them, “You claim that you are supporters of God Most High and that His prophet is among you. However the polytheists have taken control of the well while you pray needful of purity.” Then God sent down heavy rain, and the Muslims drank and purified themselves. God removed the whisper of Satan from them and made firm the sand with the rain. The people and their animals walked on it, and they proceeded towards the enemy. God assisted His prophet and the believers with a thousand angels. Gabriel was with five hundred on one side, and Michael was with five hundred on the other side.

The two versions of events are contradictory and cannot be harmonized. Either the Muslims took control over the water supply, or Quraysh did. Moreover, acceptance of one version of events entails that the other version of events was invented. In other words, if the Muslims were in control of the cistern, then it never happened that: 1) Satan cast frustration into the hearts of the Muslims; and 2) the Muslims purified themselves with rain. If Quraysh controlled the cistern however, then: 1) a miraculous rain was never sent; 2) al-Ḥubāb never made his suggestion to Muḥammad; 3) an angel never instructed Muḥammad to heed the advice of al-Ḥubāb; and 4) the Prophet never allowed some men of Quraysh to drink from the cistern.

<sup>589</sup> Under Q. 8:11. Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar b. Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘azīm* (Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1966), 3:289.

## Conclusion

For the story of the Battle of Badr, the version of Ibn Ishāq and that attributed to Mūsā have in common a number of reports arranged in the same chronological order. Although the reports for the most part resemble one another, they are also characterized by significant variations. In addition, Ibn Ishāq's version in one instance displays more certainty than Mūsā-v, and in both versions are incorporated *asbāb al-nuzūl*.

At times the two versions contradict one another, but more substantially the two versions relate different plots on occasion. The start of the narrative up to the arrival at Badr by the two armies in particular is dramatically dissimilar, resulting in alternate storylines. Here it seems that Ibn Ishāq maintained some measure of liberty in the piecing together and editing of his narrative of events. Finally comparisons with traditions from other sources reveal not only that the version of Ibn Ishāq underwent alteration but also that invention played a role in the development of the Badr narrative.

## CONCLUSION

The Ibn Ishāq-material in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarī is by and large the same for the Battle of Badr. At the same time, the material was reconstructed and modified in a number of instances, sometimes out of doctrinal concerns. Although Ibn Ishāq's material was used by al-Wāqidī for his version of Badr, al-Wāqidī did not cite Ibn Ishāq as an authority. Both Ibn Ishāq's and al-Wāqidī's versions of Badr were affected by pro-ʿAbbāsīd bias, and both included storytelling material.

The storyline of Badr is best understood in two sections. The latter half—the battle scenes and thereafter—is composed of an understandable outline of events which is agreed upon in the narrative of Ibn Ishāq and that ascribed to Mūsā. The first half however—from the beginning of Badr to the night before the battle—is incomprehensible seeing not only as invention played a role in the development of the story but also as divergent and incompatible narratives are being reported.

This quandary has not been appropriately addressed by modern scholars. Watt and Rodinson in their reproduction of the story's part do not draw from Ibn Ishāq and therefore avoid dealing with his reconstructed storyline.<sup>590</sup> By referring to ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr's alleged letter to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik however, they are faced with the same problem which was discovered in the Mūsā-version: the impossibility of the Muslims reaching Badr at the same time as Quraysh, i.e., in five or six days, since the Muslims' journey from Medina to Badr would have taken only one or two days.

Hamidullah who appears to also draw from ʿUrwa's letter attempts to resolve the difficulty by suggesting that the Prophet prolonged his stay at Badr:

It may be asked, why did the Prophet Muhammad continue to stay in Badr so long even after the escape of the caravan, and not return to

---

<sup>590</sup> That the Muslims were aware of Quraysh's advance against them prior to reaching the water at Badr. See pages 171-74 of the present study. For the accounts of Watt and Rodinson, see William Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad at Medina* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1981), 11; and Maxime Rodinson, *Muhammad*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., trans. Anne Carter (London: Penguin Books, 1971), 164-66.

Medina, his base and stronghold? It may be suggested that he wanted to utilize the opportunity of this journey in order to contact local tribes and to conclude pacts of friendship and alliance if possible, and thus extend his sphere of influence on the territory through which the Meccan caravans passed to and from Syria.<sup>591</sup>

On the contrary, ‘Urwa’s account offers no indication that Muḥammad’s stay at Badr was an extended one. Rather it intimates that the Muslims and Meccans arrived there at the same time, for immediately prior to the Muslims’ encounter with the water-carriers of Quraysh, the Prophet had been marching towards Badr: *wa-sāra l-nabiyyu ṣallā llāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallam ḥattā ‘arrasa qarīban min badr.*<sup>592</sup>

The quandary is elucidated through an examination of the method in ‘Urwa’s account. The story is not related according to a predetermined narrative but is in fact a combined report. Internal evidence of this combination of reports which is found in and preceding the story of interrogation is a repetition of the topos (italicized) that the Muslims were unaware of Quraysh’s advance against them:<sup>593</sup>

When Abū Sufyān heard that the companions of the Prophet had set out against him, he sent to Quraysh: “Muḥammad and his companions are coming against you, so protect your merchandise.” When the news reached Quraysh, the people of Mecca hastened towards the caravan, for all the clans of Ka’b b. Lu’ayy were represented in Abū Sufyān’s caravan. The force comprised of Banū Ka’b b. Lu’ayy and no one of Banū ‘Āmir, except for some of Banū Mālik b. Ḥisl. *Neither the Prophet nor his companions heard about the force of Quraysh until the Prophet reached Badr, which was on the route of the riders of Quraysh who had taken the coastal road to Syria. Abū Sufyān then doubled back from Badr and kept to the coastal road, fearful of an ambush at Badr.*

The Prophet marched forward and alighted near Badr. He sent al-Zubayr al-‘Awwām with a group of his companions to the water of Badr. *They did not suppose that Quraysh had come out against them, but while the Prophet was standing in prayer some water-carriers of Quraysh suddenly came to the water of Badr.*<sup>594</sup>

The repetition stands out as an irregularity in the narrative. Seeing as the repeated topos is in close proximity with the initial topos, the repetition cannot have been

<sup>591</sup> Muhammad Hamidullah, *The Battlefields of the Prophet Muhammad*, rev. ed. Centre Cultural Islamique (Hyderabad, 1973), 18.

<sup>592</sup> Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, 3:1286.

<sup>593</sup> More evidence of the combined report in ‘Urwa’s version is indicated in Abū Sufyān’s return from Syria and in the beating and interrogation of the slave. *Ibid.*, 1284-85, 1286-87.

<sup>594</sup> *Ibid.*, 1285-86.

coincidental. Consequently, the narrative is not a flowing, continuous one; it was pieced together as two distinct reports in the manner of the combined report. The incoherence of the resultant storyline<sup>595</sup> reveals not only that the two reports previously did not belong to one another but also that the content in at least one of the reports is erroneous.

Problematic as they are, these components nonetheless comprise the essential outlines of the Badr story and have been included by Watt, Rodinson, Hamidullah and others who have composed a biography of the Prophet. It remains to be seen whether another reproduction of the Battle of Badr will relate a narrative free of incoherence or reconstruction.

---

<sup>595</sup> The simultaneous arrival of the Muslims and Meccans at Badr.

## WORKS CITED

- Abbott, Nabia. *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri*. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Kitāb al-maghāzī of al-Wāqidī* by Marsden Jones. *The American Historical Review* 73 (1968): 865.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ḥadīth Literature-II: Collection and Transmission of Ḥadīth." In Beeston, 289-98.
- ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣan‘ānī. *Al-Muṣannaf*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 11 vols. Edited by Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān A‘zamī. Beirut: Tawzī‘ al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983.
- Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh. *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’ ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā’*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1967.
- Al-Balādhurī, Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir. *Futūḥ al-buldān*. Edited by M. J. de Goeje. Leiden: Brill, 1866.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ansāb al-ashraf*. Edited by Muḥammad Hamīd Allāh. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1959.
- Al-Bayhaqī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn. *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa wa-ma‘rifat aḥwāl ṣāhib al-sharī‘a*. 7 vols. Edited by ‘Abd al-Mu‘ṭī Qal‘ajī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiya, 1985.
- Beeston, A. F. L., T. M. Johnstone, R. B. Serjeant, and G. R. Smith, eds. *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Bloom, Jonathan. *Paper before Print: The History and Impact of Paper in the Islamic World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- BSOAS = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
- Al-Bukhārī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl. *Al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ*. 4 vols. Edited by Ludolf Krehl and Th. W. Juynboll. Leiden: Brill, 1862-1908.
- Caetani, Leone. *Annali dell’Islām*. 10 vols. Milan: Hoepli, 1905-26.
- Calder, Norman. *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Conrad, Lawrence I. "Abraha and Muḥammad: Some Observations Apropos of Chronology and Literary Topoi in the Early Arabic Historical Tradition." *BSOAS* 50, no. 2 (1987): 225-40.
- Cook, Michael. *Muḥammad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Crone, Patricia. *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

- . *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Mīzān al-ītidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*. 4 vols. Edited by ‘A. M. al-Bajāwī. Beirut, 1963.
- . *Siyār a’lām al-nubalā’*. 25 vols. Edited by Shu‘ayb al-Arna’uṭ and Ḥusayn al-Asad. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1981-88.
- Donner, Fred. *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing*. Princeton: Darwin Press, 1997.
- Duri, A. A. “Al-Zuhrī: A Study of the Beginnings of History Writing in Islam.” *BSOAS* 9, no. 1 (1957): 1-12.
- . *The Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*. Translated and edited by Lawrence I. Conrad. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- EI*<sup>2</sup> = *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Leiden: Brill, 1954-2004.
- EI*<sup>3</sup> = *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Leiden: Brill, 2007-.
- El-Hibri, Tayeb. *Reinterpreting Islamic Historiography: Hārūn al-Rashīd and the Narrative of the ‘Abbāsīd Caliphate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- EQ* = *Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān*. Leiden: Brill, 2001-6.
- Faizer, Rizwi S. “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqīdī Revisited: A Case Study of Muḥammad and the Jews in Biographical Literature.” PhD diss., McGill University, 1995.
- . “Muhammad and the Medinan Jews: A Comparison of the Texts of Ibn Ishaq’s *Kitāb Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* with al-Wāqīdī’s *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28 (1996): 463-89.
- . “The Issue of Authenticity Regarding the Traditions of al-Wāqīdī as Established in his *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 58, no. 2 (1999): 97-106.
- Faruqi, Nisar Ahmed. *Early Muslim Historiography: A Study of Early Transmitters of Arab History from the Rise of Islam up to the End of the Umayyad Period, 612-750 A.D.* Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1979.
- Fück, Johann. “Muḥammad Ibn Ishāq. Literarhistorische Untersuchungen.” Phil diss., Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1925.
- Goldziher, Ignaz. *Muslim Studies*. 2 vols. Translated and edited by S. M. Stern and C. R. Barber. London: Allen and Unwin, 1967-71.
- Gordon, Matthew. “The Samarran Turkish Community in the *Ta’rīkh* of al-Ṭabarī.” In Kennedy, 237-62.

- Guillaume, Alfred. *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ishāq's Sīrat Rasūl Allāh with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Günther, Sebastian. "Al-Nawfalī's Lost History: a Shī'ī Source Used by al-Ṭabarī and Abū l-Faraj." In Kennedy, 157-74.
- Hamidullah, Muhammad. *The Battlefields of the Prophet Muhammad*. Rev. ed. Centre Cultural Islamique. Hyderabad, 1973.
- Hawting, Gerald. "Al-Ḥudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca: A Reconsideration of the Tradition about the Muslim Takeover of the Sanctuary." In *The Life of Muḥammad*, edited by Uri Rubin, 245-68. Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998.
- Horovitz, Josef. *De Wâqidii libro qui Kitâb al Mağâzî inscribitur*. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1898.
- . "Alter und Ursprung des Isnād." *Der Islam* 8 (1918): 39-47.
- . *The Earliest Biographies of the Prophet and their Authors*. Edited by Lawrence I. Conrad. Princeton: Darwin Press, 2002.
- Humphreys, R. Stephen. *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry*. Rev. ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh. *Jāmi' bayān al-'ilm wa-faḍlih wa-mā yanbaghī fī riwāyatihi wa-ḥamlihi*. 2 vols. Edited by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān. Al-Madīnah al-Mudawwarah: Al-Maktabah al-Sulfiyah, 1968.
- Ibn 'Asākir. *Ta'rīkh madīnat Dimashq*. 70 vols. Edited by 'Umar Gharāmah al-'Amrawī. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-98.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmad b. 'Alī. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*. Edited by Yūsuf b. al-Zakī 'Abd al-Raḥmān Mizzī and 'Abd al-Ghanī b. 'Abd al-Wāḥid Jammā'īlī. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968.
- Ibn Hishām, 'Abd al-Malik. *Das Leben Muhammed's nach Muhammed Ibn Ishāk bearbeitet von Abd el-Malik Ibn Hishām*. 2 vols. Edited by Ferdinand Wüstenfeld. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1858-60.
- . *Al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*. 2 vols. Edited by Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī. Cairo: Maktabat wa-Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1955.
- Ibn Ishāq, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-siyar wa-l-maghāzī, recension of Yūnus b. Bukayr*. Edited by Suhayl Zakkār. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1978.
- Ibn Kathīr, Ismā'īl b. 'Umar. *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 14 vols. Edited by Aḥmad Abū Milḥim. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1988.
- . *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'azīm*. 7 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1966.

- Ibn al-Nadīm, Abū al-Faraj Muḥammad b. Ishāq. *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. 2 Vols. Edited by Gustav Flügel. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1871-72.
- Ibn Sa‘d, Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*. *Biographien Muḥammeds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230*. 9 vols. Edited by Eduard Sachau. Leiden: Brill, 1904-40.
- Jarrar, Maher. *Die Prophetenbiographie im islamischen Spanien. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989.
- Jones, J. M. B. “The Chronology of the *Maghāzī*: A Textual Survey.” *BSOAS* 19 (1957): 245-80.
- . “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī: The Dream of ‘Ātika and the Raid to Nakhla in Relation to the Charge of Plagiarism.” *BSOAS* 22, no. 3 (1959): 41-51.
- . “The *Maghāzī* Literature.” In Beeston, 344-51.
- Juynboll, G. H. A. *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . “Nāfi‘, the *Mawlā* of Ibn ‘Umar, and his Position in Muslim *Ḥadīth* Literature.” *Der Islam* 70 (1993): 207-44.
- Kaḥḥāla, ‘Umar Riḍā. *Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifīn: muṣannifī-l-kutub al-‘arabiya*. 15 vols. Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1957-61.
- Kennedy, Hugh, ed. *Al-Ṭabarī: A Medieval Muslim Historian and his Work*. Princeton: Darwin Press, 2008.
- . “The Sources of al-Ṭabarī’s History of the ‘Abbāsīd Caliphate.” In Kennedy, 175-86.
- Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alī. *Ta’rīkh Baghdād aw madīnat al-salām*. 14 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī, 1931.
- . *Kitāb taqyīd al-‘ilm*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Edited by Y. al-‘Ush. Beirut, 1975.
- Khoury, R. G. “Les sources islamiques de la ‘Sīra’ avant Ibn Hishām (M. 213/834) et leur valeur historique.” In *La vie du prophète Mahomet*, edited by Toufic Fahd, 7-29. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1983.
- Kister, M. J. “On the Papyrus of Wahb b. Munabbih.” *BSOAS* 37 (1974): 545-71.
- . “Poetry in the *Sīrah* Literature.” In Beeston, 368-73.
- . “The *Sīrah* Literature.” In Beeston, 352-67.
- Landau-Tasserou, Ella. “Processes of Redaction: The Case of the Tamīmīte Delegation to the Prophet Muḥammad.” *BSOAS* 49 (1986): 255-70.
- Lane, Edward William. *Arabic-English Lexicon*. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863.

- Lecker, Michael. "The Death of the Prophet Muḥammad's Father: Did Wāqidī Invent Some of the Evidence?" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 145 (1995): 10-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wāqidī's Account of the Status of the Jews of Medina: A Study of a Combined Report." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54, no. 1 (1995): 15-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "King Ibn Ubayy and the Quṣṣāṣ." In *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, edited by Herbert Berg, 29-72. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Leder, Stefan. "Authorship and Transmission in Unauthored Literature: The Akhbār Attributed to al-Haytham ibn 'Adī." *Oriens* 31 (1988): 67-81.
- Lilie, Ralph-Johannes. "Theophanes and al-Ṭabarī on the Arab Invasions of Byzantium." In Kennedy, 219-36.
- Mattock, J. N. "History and Fiction." In *Occasional Papers of the School of 'Abbasid Studies*, edited by D. E. P. Jackson, 80-97. Edinburgh: University of St. Andrews, 1986.
- Motzki, Harald. "Quo vadis, Ḥadīṭ-Forschung? Eine kritische Untersuchung von G. H. A. Juynboll: Nāfi' the Mawlā of Ibn 'Umar, and his Position in Muslim Ḥadīṭ Literature." *Der Islam* 73 (1996): 40-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some Maghāzī-Reports." In Motzki, *Biography*, 170-239.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan fiqh before the Classical Schools*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Author and his Work in the Islamic Literature." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003): 171-201.
- Muranyi, Miklos. "Ibn Ishāq's Kitāb al-Maghāzī in der Riwāya von Yūnus b. Bukayr. Bermerkungen zur frühen Überlieferungsgeschichte." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 14 (1991): 214-75.
- Mūsā b. 'Uqba. *Al-Maghāzī*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāqshīsh Abū Mālik. Agadir: Jāmi'at Ibn Zuhr, Kulliyat al-Ādāb wa-l-'Ulūm al-Insānīya, 1994.
- Newby, Gordon Darnell. *The Making of the Last Prophet: A Reconstruction of the Earliest Biography of Muḥammad*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
- Noth, Albrecht. "Der Charakter der ersten grossen Sammlungen von Nachrichten zur frühen Kalifenzeit." *Der Islam* 47, no. 1 (1971): 168-99.
- Noth, Albrecht and Lawrence I. Conrad. *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-Critical Study*. Translated by Michael Bonner. Princeton: Darwin Press, 1994.

- Nyberg, H. S. "Bemerkungen zum 'Buch der Götzenbilder' von Ibn Al-Kalbī." In *Dragma Martino P. Nilsson Dedicatum*, 2, 347-66. Lund: Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae, 1939.
- Osman, Ghada. "Oral vs. Written Transmission: The Case of Ṭabarī and Ibn Sa'd," *Arabica* 48, no. 1 (2001): 66-80.
- Petersen, Erling L. *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya in Early Arabic Tradition*. Odense: Odense University Press, 1974.
- Poonawala, Ismail K. See al-Ṭabarī.
- Robinson, Chase F. *Islamic Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Rodinson, Maxime. *Muḥammad*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Translated by Anne Carter. London: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Rosenthal, Franz. *A History of Muslim Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- . *General Introduction*. See al-Ṭabarī.
- Rubin, Uri. *The Eye of the Beholder: The Life of Muḥammad as Viewed by the Early Muslims—a Textual Analysis*. Princeton: Darwin Press, 1995.
- . "The Life of Muḥammad and the Islamic Self-Image: A Comparative Analysis of an Episode in the Campaigns of Badr and al-Ḥudaybiya." In Motzki, *Biography*, 3-17.
- Sachau, Eduard. "Das Berliner Fragment des Mūsā ibn ʿUqba. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss des ältesten arabischen Geschichtsliteratur." *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 9 (1904): 445-70.
- Salmān, Mashhūr Ḥasan. *Aḥādīth muntakhaba min Maghāzī Mūsā b. ʿUqba*. Beirut, 1991.
- Al-Samuk, Sadun Mahmud. "Die historischen Überlieferungen nach Ibn Ishāq. Eine synoptische Untersuchung." Phil diss., Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 1978.
- Schacht, Joseph. "A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 49 (1949): 143-54.
- . "On Mūsā b. ʿUqba's Kitāb al-Maghāzī." *Acta Orientalia* 21 (1953): 288-300.
- . Review of *A History of Muslim Historiography* by Franz Rosenthal. *Oriens* 7 (1954): 153-56.
- Schoeler, Gregor. *Charakter und Authentie der muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Mohammeds*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- . "Mūsā b. ʿUqbas Maghāzī." In Motzki, *Biography*, 67-97.

- . *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*. Edited by James E. Montgomery. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- . “The Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” In Schoeler, *Oral and the Written*, 28-44.
- . “The Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam Revisited.” In Schoeler, *Oral and the Written*, 45-61.
- . “Oral Torah and Ḥadīṭ: Transmission, Prohibition of Writing, Redaction.” In Schoeler, *Oral and the Written*, 111-41.
- . *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: from the Aural to the Read*. Rev. Ed. Translated by Shawkat Toorawa. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
- Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: Brill, 1967-2000.
- Al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad. *Al-Muʿjam al-kabīr*. 25 vols. Edited by Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī. Baghdad: Jumhūrīya al-‘Irāqīya, 1980-85.
- Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Jarīr. *Jāmi‘ al-bayān ‘an ta’wīl āy al-Qur’ān*. 16 vols. Edited by Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākīr and Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākīr. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1955-1969.
- . *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*. 15 vols. Edited by M. J. de Goeje. Leiden: Brill, 1879-1901.
- . *General Introduction and from Creation to the Flood*. Translated and edited by Franz Rosenthal. Vol. 1 of *The History of al-Ṭabarī*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- . *Muḥammad at Mecca*. Translated and edited by William Montgomery Watt and M. V. McDonald. Vol. 6 of *The History of al-Ṭabarī*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- . *The Last Years of the Prophet*. Translated and edited by Ismail K. Poonawala. Vol. 9 of *The History of al-Ṭabarī*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- Toorawa, Shawkat. *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr and Arabic Writerly Culture: A Ninth-Century Bookman in Baghdad*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- von Mzik, Hans. “Die Gideon-Saul-Legende und die Überlieferung der Schlacht bei Badr. Ein Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte des Islāms.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 29 (1915): 371-83.
- Wansbrough, John. *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- . *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Al-Wāqidī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Umar. *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. 3 vols. Edited by Marsden Jones. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Watt, William Montgomery. *Muhammad at Medina*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Watt, William Montgomery and M. V. McDonald. See al-Ṭabarī.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Muhammad in Medina. Das ist Vakidi's Kitab alMaghazi in verkürzter deutscher Wiedergabe*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1882.

----- . “Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams.” In *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 6, 1-160. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1899.

Widengren, Geo. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948.

----- . “Oral Tradition and Written Literature among the Hebrews in the Light of Arabic Evidence, with Special Regard to Prose Narratives.” *Acta Orientalia* 23 (1959): 201-62.

Yāqūt b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥamawī. *Irshād al-arīb ilā ma‘rifat al-adīb*. 7 vols. Edited by D. S. Margoliouth. London, 1923-31.

Al-Ziriklī, Khayr al-Dīn. *Al-A‘lām: qāmūs tarājim al-ashhar al-rijāl wa-l-nisā’ min al-‘arab wa-l-musta‘rabīn wa-l-mustashriqīn*. 10 vols. Cairo, 1959.

Al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, Abū ‘Abd Allāh. *Al-Akhbār al-muwaffaqiyāt*. Edited by Sāmī Makkī al-‘Ānī. Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-‘Ānī, 1972.