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ABSTRACT

The sīra material of Ibn Isḥāq, 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 Isḥāq-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 Isḥāq, as both versions in a number of locations are exactly parallel. Also in both versions of Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī were found pro-'Abbāsid bias and storytelling material. A comparison between the material of Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq and Alteration
    Part 1..........................................................................................................................................................52
    Part 2..........................................................................................................................................................67

CHAPTER 2—Al-Wāqidī and Dependence...........................................................................................................101

CHAPTER 3—Mūsā b. ʿUqba and Differentiation
    Part 1..........................................................................................................................................................136
    Part 2..........................................................................................................................................................153

CONCLUSION.....................................................................................................................................................182

WORKS CITED....................................................................................................................................................185
INTRODUCTION

Ibn Isḥāq (d. 150/767), al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) and Mūsā b. ʿUqba (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 Isḥāq; 2) al-Wāqidī’s dependence upon Ibn Isḥāq, and; 3) differences between the material of Ibn Isḥāq and that ascribed to Mūsā.

Alteration of Ibn Isḥāq’s Material

Ibn Isḥāq and his Material in Later Recensions

The full name of the first of the traditionists is Muḥammad b. Isḥāq b. Yasār b. Khiyār. It is said that he composed a biography of the Prophet, or the Sīra. It is also said that the book was written at the request of the caliph alc-Manṣūr (r. 136/754-158/775). 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. This judgment is based upon analyses of the existing data, i.e. Ibn Isḥāq’s material found in the recensions of his students and later authors. Johann Fück in his dissertation has listed

---

1 According to some sources, b. Khabbār, or Kūmān, or Kūtān. EI, s.v. “Ibn Isḥāḳ.”
3 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAlī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Taʾrīkh Baghdād aw madīnat al-ṣalām (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī, 1931), 1:221.
4 Horovitz argues that Ibn Isḥāq’s material did not originate at the time of alc-Manṣūr but much earlier: “That Ibn Isḥāq wrote his Kitāb al-maghāzi 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 Horovitz, 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 Taʾrīkh al-khulafāʾ.” 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):

1. Ibrāhīm b. Saʿd (110/728-184/800) in Medina
2. Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkāʾī (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. Saīd al-Umawī (114/732-194/810) in Baghdad
9. Hārūn b. Ṭsā
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-Mukhtar in Rayy
13. Saīd b. Bazī
14. 'Uthmān b. Sāj
15. Muḥammad b. Salama al-Harrānī (d. 191/807)

Nabia Abbott reports three additional students:

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-ʿAwfī (d. 201/817 or 202/817)
18. Muḥammad b. Saīd 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-
Bakkāʾī; 2) Salama b. al-Faḍl; and 3) Yūnus b. Bukayr.

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

---

5 Johann Fück, “Muḥammad Ibn Ishāq. Literarhistorische Untersuchungen,” (Phil. diss., Universität
Frankfurt am Main, 1925), 44.
6 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.
7 Ahmad b. ’Ali b. Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, ed. Yūsuf b. al-Zakī 'Abd al-Rahmān Mızzī and 'Abd
al-Ghani b. 'Abd al-Wāḥīd Jammāʿīlī (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 3:375-77; Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh
8 Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, 3:376.
among Ibn Isḥāq’s students. Rizwi Faizer also regards the recension of al-Bakkāʾī to be accurate, but her estimation is drawn from her analysis of the Ibn Isḥāq-material concerning Muḥammad’s treatment of the Jews in Medina.

Al-Bakkāʾī 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 Isḥāq. 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 Isḥāq recorded in this book, including what was not told about the Prophet, about which the Qurʾān 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-Bakkāʾī did not establish for me as trustworthy in his riwāya.

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

---


12 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 Muhammad: A Translation of Isḥāq’s Sīrat Rasūl Allāh with Introduction and Notes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), xlii-xlii.

13 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 Isḥāq’s work.” Ibid., xli.

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). In the *Tafsīr*, Salama’s Ibn Isḥāq-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 Isḥāq. 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. Notably, the *Taʾrīkh* includes two stories by Ibn Isḥāq that have been omitted from the recension of Ibn Hishām: Muḥammad’s intended suicide and the “satanic verses.”

It is said that a qādī of Rayy, Ibn Saʿd, reported Salama’s transmission of the *maghāzī*. It is also said that Salama produced the most complete book of the *maghāzī*. Other reports indicate that Salama’s version of the *maghāzī* is identical to that of Ibn Isḥāq. In one such report, Salama claimed to have heard the *maghāzī* twice from his master through *samʿ* (lecture). According to a different report, the *qarāṭīs* (scrolls) from which Ibn Isḥāq wrote his *Kitāb al-jabīr* for the caliph were inherited by Salama.

Some modern scholars regard the work of Salama as the most accurate transmission of the words of Ibn Isḥāq. Gordon Newby asserts, “From him [Salama] we have the most

---

15 For a list of al-Ṭabarī’s works including the *Taʾrīkh* and *Tafsīr*, see Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrīst*, 1:234.
16 Another work that includes the history of the kings of Persia is al-Dīnawarī’s *Al-Akhbār al-tiwāl*. 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.” *EI*, s.v. “Abū Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Aḥmad b. Dāwūd.”
18 Ibid., 1192-96.
19 Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib al-tahdhib*, 4:104. In the report, Salama also transmits the *mubtadaʿ*.
22 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh al-Baghdād*, 1:221.
reliable transmission of the original Sîrah.’” 23 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 Taʾrîkh along with the rest of Ibn Isḥāq’s works, but that his transmission was the one consistently used by Ṭabarī himself. 24

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

That the Ibn Isḥāq-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.” 27 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 Isḥāq-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 Isḥāq, a high degree of identicalness discovered may be sufficient for the Ibn

24 Abbott, Studies, 1:94.
26 Abbott, Studies, 1:94. However Rosenthal asserts that a reference in the work of Yāqūt in which Ibn Kāmil credits Ahmad b. Ḥammād as the teacher of Ibn Isḥāq’s mubtadaʾ- 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.
Isḥāq-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 Isḥāq-material may not be as faultless as a written text by Ibn Isḥāq, and any shortcomings from the comparisons may be attributable to this difference.

The work of Yūnus b. Bukayr, 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-ʿUṭāridī (177/794-272/886), is approximately one-fifth the size of the recension of Ibn Hishām. Although the analysis does not involve the work of Ibn Bukayr, some comments concerning his work are relevant to the study of the Ibn-Isḥāq-material.

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

---

30 Ibid., 23.
addition, Zakkār notices that the recension of al-ʿUṭāridī is more pro-ʿAlī than the recensions of Ibn Hishām and Salama, both of which he believes were composed later at the ʿAbbāsid court and were edited to the satisfaction of the caliph. Another difference in the recension of al-ʿUṭāridī 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 Isḥāq material in al-ʿUṭāridī’s recension.

Although an aim in chapter 1 is determining the level of identicalness of the Ibn Isḥāq-material in the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarî, the chapter’s main objective has to do with the variants between the recensions. A student of Ibn Isḥāq 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. 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 Ἰσμα*

The doctrine of Ἰσμα (immunity from error and sin), which originated in the second Islamic century, gave rise to alterations in the Muslim traditions. 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

---

35 EQ, s.v. “Sīra and the Qurʾān.”
36 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.
37 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.” *EF*, s.v. “ἰσμα.”
circulation, especially in the canonical muṣannaf collections of ḥadīth. 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 muṣannaf compilations due to dogmatic concerns by the compilers. Other instances are the story of Muḥammad’s intended suicide 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 ʿisma 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. 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

---

38 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 ʿAbbāsid 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.

39 Ibid., 163.

40 Ibid., 114.

41 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.\footnote{Abbott, Studies, 2:2.} She considers the Companions Anas b. Mālik (d. 91/709-93/711), Ṭabīb Allāh b. Ṭābi‘ al-‘Āṣ (d. 42/663), Ibn Abbās (d. 68/687-8), and Abū Hurayah (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.”\footnote{Ibid., 11.} Abbott provides the names of other collectors and the reports thereof which describe their collecting activity:

Among this group was ʿAmr 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 Kaʿb ibn Ṭābiʿ (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-Ajdā‘ (d. 63/682), who is said to have been adopted by ‘Āʾishah and who traveled widely in search of ‘ilm, which he wrote down. One may mention, finally, the Yemenite ʿAmr 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, ʿAlī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, and others. He settled in Kūfah and wrote on historical subjects, and Ibn Isḥāq of Sīrah fame drew freely from his works.\footnote{Ibid., 11-12.}

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
hadīth 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.\(^\text{45}\)

Schoeler rejects this linear development of religious instruction which originated with the Prophet and developed into the later system of hadīth transmission. For Schoeler, the system of hadīth transmission was introduced in the last third of the first/seventh century beginning with systematic collections by scholars such as ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712).\(^\text{46}\) 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).\(^\text{47}\) 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.\(^\text{48}\) 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.\(^\text{49}\)

Around this time, an aversion to the writing down of traditions is said to have existed.\(^\text{50}\) In view of the aversion, ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr reportedly burned his recordings, i.e., notes used as mnemonic aids, and possibly lecture notebooks.\(^\text{51}\) The only writings of ʿUrwa that have survived are his rasāʾil (letters) to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 65/685-692).

---

\(^{45}\) 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.


\(^{48}\) 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.


\(^{50}\) Chase Robinson describes the aversion for recording as a “fairly fierce polemic against writing,” in his Islamic Historiography (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 24.

\(^{51}\) Schoeler, Charakter, 53.
86/705) who had requested from ʿUrwa certain information concerning the life of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{52} It is debatable however whether these extant rasāʾil are in their original or edited form. Robinson’s estimation of ʿUrwa 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 ʿUrwa 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.”\textsuperscript{53}

On the other hand, Schoeler points out that the title “founder of historical study in Islam” is awarded to ʿUrwa by other Western scholars.\textsuperscript{54}

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. ʿUthmān (d. between 96/714 and 105/723-24) to write down the reports about the life (siyar) and campaigns (magḥāzī) of the Prophet. The caliph then had ten scribes copy and write down Abān’s material on parchment.\textsuperscript{55} In another report, the following caliph ʿUmar 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.\textsuperscript{56} ʿUmar II is said to have feared the “disappearance of tradition and the extinction of its carriers.”

It was Ibn Shihāb alcZuhrī (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

\textsuperscript{52} The alleged letters are found in al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 1:1181 and 1284-88.

\textsuperscript{53} Robinson, Islamic Historiography, 24. Schoeler says, “It is out of the question that ‘Urwa wrote a K. al-Magḥāzī in the sense of a definitively edited book (syngramma), as rather late sources allege.” EFi, 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.” Maherr Jarrar, Die Prophetenbiographie im Islamischen Spanien. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989), 20.

\textsuperscript{54} EFi, s.v. “‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr.”


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

Al-Zuhrī is said to have had reservations about recording hadīths 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].”59 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.”60 Al-Zuhrī’s acceptance
of the writing of hadīths is attested in another report: “Had it not been for the hadīth
reaching us from the East [i.e. ʿIrāq], with which we are not acquainted and which we
reject, I would neither have recorded hadīths nor would have permitted others to do
so.”61 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 hadīths. Schoeler also maintains that al-Zuhrī created the first
definitive framework for the biography of Muḥammad.62 Al-Zuhrī received this
framework, according to Fred Donner, from authorities such as ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr, Saʿīd
b. al-Musayyab, and ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUtba. Al-Zuhrī’s work is not extant,
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57 Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫāmiʾ bayān al-ʿilm wa-fadḥilīh wa-ma-yunbaghi fi riwāyatīhi wa-ḥamlīhī, ed.
58 Schoeler, “Oral Torah and Ḥadīṯ,” 124. Schoeler points out that the report in which ʿUmar 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 ʿUthmān’s distribution of the standardized
Qurʾān. The report is found in Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫāmiʾ bayān, 1:91-92.
59 ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī, Al-Muṣannaf, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān Aʿẓamī (Beirut: Tawzīʿ al-
60 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫāmiʾ bayān, 1:92.
62 Schoeler, Charakter, 37.
but many of its excerpts are said to be present in later sources. Goldziher pointed out that al-Zuhrī occasionally bowed to Umayyad pressure and sanctioned traditions that were advantageous to the rulers.

In the following generation, the writing down of traditions was the norm. 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.” No longer were papyrus (qiṣrāṣ) 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. 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. It is at the beginning of this generation that Ibn Isḥāq is reported to have written his book about the Prophet.

64 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.”
65 In a report in which Hishām b. ʿUrwa denied that Ibn Isḥāq made visits to his wife, Hishām asserts, “The people of Medina consider writing as permissible.” Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, 9:42.
66 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.
Schoeler argues that Ibn Isḥāq’s Kitāb al-magḥāzī was part of an emerging genre of structured works (muṣannafāt). These structured works were divided by chapters and were of an intermediate kind between syngrammata (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).

Schoeler also argues that the Kitāb al-magḥāzī was not meant for public or lay circles. Instead the Kitāb al-magḥāzī, 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-magḥāzī was utilized is the explanation Schoeler offers for the question in modern scholarship of why the book has not survived today. A related question is what to make of magḥāzī traditions that go back to Ibn Isḥāq but do not form part of his Kitāb al-magḥāzī. In response, Schoeler offers the possibility that Ibn Isḥāq simply reported hadīths about the Prophet that were not included in his Kitāb al-magḥāzī. 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 Isḥāq upon the completion of his book continued to conduct lectures in the areas of Kufa, al-Hira, and Rayy.

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 samʿ (audition). In this form of teaching, the material was heard/audited/aural tradition (al-jriwāya ljmasmūʿa) 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
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69 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 alc-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Ṭabarī and Abū alc-Faraj.


72 Schoeler, “Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” 30. According to Schoeler, heard/audited/aural tradition (al-riwāya l-masmūʿa) 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 qirāʾa (recitation), later also known as ‘árḍ (presentation). During ‘árḍ, the student recited from memory or read from his written notes while the teacher listened and made corrections. According to Schoeler, these two forms of teaching were capable of reliably and authentically disseminating knowledge. 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.

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.” 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. Thus in the case of Ibn Isḥāq’s Kitāb al-
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73 Schoeler notes, “These ‘lectures’ were held in majālis or mujālasāt (sessions) and halaqāt (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.
74 Ibid., 42.
75 Abbott, Studies, 1:94; Ef’, s.v. “idjāza.”
maghāzī, Schoeler asserts that the existence of its divergent recensions is unsurprising, even though the author himself had given his material a fixed shape.\textsuperscript{78}

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.\textsuperscript{79}

**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-ʿAbbās in effect encompass his entire involvement at Badr.\textsuperscript{80} Ibn Hishām’s pro-ʿAbbāsid bias also led him to interpolate the conversion of al-ʿAbbās to Islam.\textsuperscript{81} This issue of pro-ʿAbbāsid 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).

\textsuperscript{78} Schoeler, “Transmission of the Sciences in Early Islam: Oral or Written?” 34.
\textsuperscript{80} 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-ʿAbbās’ involvement against the Prophet at Badr.” Horovitz, *Earliest Biographies*, 80-82.
\textsuperscript{81} Guillaume notes that the conversion is not found in al-Ṭabarī’s quotation from Ibn Ishāq. Guillaume, *Life of Muḥammad*, 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. 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. With the identification and removal of transcription errors, the edition was a scholarly attempt at reconstructing the original words of Ibn Hishām. For the analysis of the Ibn Isḥāq-material in chapter 1, the more recent critical edition of Ibn Hishām’s work by Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibhrāhīm al-Abārī and ‘Abd al-Ḥafīẓ Shalabī is utilized. The sources employed for their edition include the work by Wüstenfeld.

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. This idea prevailed into the time of al-Ṭabarī. Schoeler says of al-Ṭabarī and authors like him:

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.
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82 See Schoeler, Charakter, 51-52.
84 According to Schoeler, the variations are typical of those which generate as a result of written transmission. Schoeler, Charakter, 53.
86 For the seven other sources utilized for this edition, see the introduction to ibid., 1:23-24.
88 The other authors are al-Bukhārī, Abū al-Faraj al-İsfahānī and Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī.
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 huddithtu meant his reliance on older books for which he had no firm transmission tradition on which he could rely.⁹⁰ That the transmission to al-Ṭabarī from Ibn Sa’d in al-Ṭabarī’s Taʾrīkh 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.⁹¹

Concerning bias in the work of al-Ṭabarī, Hugh Kennedy provides a general comment on his material for the early ʿAbbāsid period: “As a whole, the work is not ‘biased’ in any simple way, it is only pro-ʿAbbāsid 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.”⁹² More specifically, Sebastian Günther’s study of a Shīʿī source (that of al-Nawfalī) used by al-Ṭabarī and Abū al-Faraj discovers that while Abū al-Faraj explicitly emphasizes Shīʿī themes, al-Ṭabarī quotes only that information dealing with the history of the ʿAbbāsid 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 Shīʿī.”⁹³ Al-Nawfalī’s work being radically Imāmī would have been highly problematic for al-Ṭabarī.

⁹⁰ EI², s.v. “Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ḏj̲afar Muhammad b. Ḏj̲arīr b. Yazīd.”
⁹¹ Ghada Osman, “Oral vs. Written Transmission: The Case of Ṭabarī and Ibn Saʿd,” Arabica 48, no. 1 (2001): 80. Osman notices that while al-Ṭabarī was using Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq’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.
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.” 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.

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 Taʾrīkh, which was brought into publication in three series by M. J. de Goeje towards the latter part of the nineteenth century. 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.
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95 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 Taʾrīkh of al-Ṭabarī,” in Kennedy, 260.
97 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.\(^{98}\) 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.\(^{99}\) 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.\(^{100}\)

In a more recent publication, J. M. B. Jones argues against the claim that al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Ishāq.\(^{101}\) His analysis of the two events in the Prophet’s biography—the raid on Nakhla and the vision of ʿĀtika—that Wellhausen had examined, leads him to conclude that al-Wāqidī drew from other than Ibn Ishāq. A significant
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\(^{98}\) 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.

\(^{99}\) 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.

\(^{100}\) Josef Horovitz, De Wâqidi libro qui Kitâb al Mgâzî inscriptur (Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1898).

reason for Jones’s conclusion is the existence of a high number of variants between the versions of Ibn Isḥāq 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. 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 Isḥāq’s basic presentation, 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 Isḥāq 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.

**Storyteller Material**

The qāṣṣ (storyteller), pl. quṣṣāṣ, to whom Jones refers was not defined by any one activity. His activities may have been as basic as commentating on the Qurʾān 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. In the most general terms, the qāṣṣ was a popular storyteller or preacher who...
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-Wāqīdī is to identify embellishments made by the raconteur. As Guilloume 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.”

While chapter 2 focuses on identifying qāṣṣ material in the work of al-Wāqīdī, an exploration of qāṣṣ material as it relates to the work of Ibn Isḥāq 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 (bidʿa). For Abbott, though qāṣṣ material may have entered the texts of Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqīdī, 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-Wāqīdī drew from without citing Ibn Isḥāq. Thus she argues against the view of Jones, pointing out that his analysis is based upon the study

---


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

of too little material. According to Abbott, an examination of a larger section of material in the works of Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī will lead to the opposite conclusion. Abbott also criticizes Jones’s usage of the phenomenon of variants between Ibn Isḥāq 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.”109 Hence Abbott argues that the presence of non-literal parallels may be proof of dependence.

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

Wāqidī did not plagiarize Ibn Isḥāq, but he did not offer an independent version of the Prophet’s life, either: what he, Ibn Isḥāq 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 . . .110

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.”111 As a result, early Muslim scholars such as Ibn Isḥāq 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

111 Ibid., 226.
are strikingly devoid of overall unity.”112 For Crone, the earliest compilations were “mere piles of disparate traditions reflecting no one personality, school, time or place.”113 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 Isḥāq 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.”114 In her assessment of Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī, she asserts:

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

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 Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī for the story of the conquest of Mecca: “If we compare Ibn Isḥāq’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.”116 Hawting argues that the increase not only raises the question of the correct context for the material but also indicates
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115 Ibid., 224.
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.”\textsuperscript{117} 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.”\textsuperscript{118} For Cook, al-Wāqidī’s “superior” knowledge is a reflection of the continuing evolution of oral tradition.\textsuperscript{119}

\textit{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 Isḥāq 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.\textsuperscript{120} In the case of Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq’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

\textsuperscript{117} Michael Cook, \textit{Muḥammad} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 64.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 67.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 66.
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.”

Lecker puts forward that “Wāqidī’s presumed ‘superior knowledge’ came from one of his sources and belonged to the major historiographical movement of the 1st/7th century.” 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.” It is possible then, according to Lecker, for the text of al-Wāqidī to contain earlier material than the text of Ibn Ishāq. 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. 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.

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
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122 Ibid., 13.
124 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 Sirah 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.
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. In his analysis of the story of the death of Muḥammad’s father, Lecker argues against the claim that the additional material of al-Wāqīdī 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 Isḥāq and al-Wāqīdī 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.

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

Lecker’s theory of the origins of Islamic historiography consists of two phases in its evolution. 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
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128 Ibid.
129 Ibid., 26.
130 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. 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. According to Lecker, this first phase witnessed the early crystallization of the traditions.

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-Zuhri, Ibn Isḥaq 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.

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

---

133 Widengren had asserted that the crystallization of the traditions took place early: “[S]īrah and hadith [were] from the outset written down.” Geo Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets (Uppsala: Lundequistka Bokhandeln, 1948), 56.
episode, are combined into one narrative by being arranged in a chronological order. 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-Wāqīḍī’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-Wāqīḍī] 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 jam‘ā’a wa-rubbamā ikhtalafū). Ibn Ḥanbal also showed his disapproval of the combined report with Ibn Isḥāq, who did not “separate the words” (lā yafṣilu kalām dhā min kalām dhā) when transmitting a hadīth from a group of informants. 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 hadīth experts. Of the six canonical hadīth collections, Ibn Māja’s collection contains the only hadīth by al-Wāqīḍī, which does not name al-Wāqīḍī in the isnād but refers to him in the ambiguous phrase “one of our shaykhs” (shaykh lanā).

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. 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
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136 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baḡdādī, Taʾrīkh Baḡdād, 3:16.
137 Ibn Hajar, Taḥdīḥ al-taḥdīḥ, 9:43.
139 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.”¹⁴⁰ In addition the combined report made possible the fusion of different events into one event,¹⁴¹ and a reconstruction of the original reports may result in several rival ‘truths’ rather than just one.¹⁴²

In a study of one of al-Wāqidi’s combined reports, Lecker shows that a passage from al-Wāqidi’s introduction to the story of the assassination of the Jewish leader Ka‘b b. al-Ashraf is corrupt.¹⁴³ 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-Wāqidi’s sources for his combined report with al-Wāqidi’s combined report itself, Lecker concludes that al-Wāqidi, 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-Wāqidi and the unedited report of the later compiler al-Bayhaqi (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-Wāqidi was analyzed by Faizer. She responds to Lecker, arguing that al-Wāqidi’s representation of the Jews as clients of the Arabs rather
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¹⁴³ Ibid., 15.
than as their original description as the strongest clan in Medina was deliberate. This purposeful misrepresentation suited al-Wāqīdī’s own version of the Prophet’s biography, and the combined report was a means by which al-Wāqīdī accomplished his objective. According to Faizer, the combined report was one of the numerous methods used by al-Wāqīdī to manipulate and distort seemingly well-known traditions in order to generate a new interpretation of the Prophet’s life.

In Faizer’s estimation, most of the edits by al-Wāqīdī were performed on the traditions in the text of Ibn Isḥāq. She considers that al-Wāqīdī understood well the text’s structure and format but cared little for authenticity and its reliable reproduction. Al-Wāqīdī 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 Isḥāq.” 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
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145 Faizer, “Issue of Authenticity,” 98. Faizer provides an example in which al-Wāqīdī 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-Wāqīdī on the other hand casts blame on the Jews themselves by placing within the event of the raid on Banū Quraṣa the tradition of the Jewish abrogation of their agreement with the Prophet and their subsequent attack against him. Faizer, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqīdī Revisited,” 209-10.
147 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.\textsuperscript{148}

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

\textit{The Views of Faizer and Schoeler}

Faizer assesses the charge of al-Wāqidī’s dependenc upon Ibn Isḥāq to be unjustified. She argues that al-Wāqidī, when utilizing the text of Ibn Isḥāq, 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 Isḥāq compilation would recognize immediately the intricate weavings of new material that al-Wāqidī introduced into the account.”\textsuperscript{149} For Faizer, al-Wāqidī desired to display his knowledge of the traditions of Ibn Isḥāq, as well as those of al-Zuhrī, Ibn ‘Umar and other Muslim authorities. At the same time however, al-Wāqidī disagreed with Ibn Isḥāq over certain details and chronology and considered some of his traditions to be out of context. By purposefully failing to cite Ibn Isḥāq and yet by ensuring that his use of Ibn Isḥāq’s familiar traditions was recognizable, al-Wāqidī, Faizer contends, brilliantly found a way of displaying Ibn Isḥāq as an authority without citing him.

\textsuperscript{148} Stefan Leder, “Authorship and Transmission in Unauthored Literature: The Akhbār attributed to Haytham ibn ‘Adī,” \textit{Oriens} (1988): 67-68. Cf. the words of Hawting in his observation of traditions related to al-Hudaybiyya 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 \textit{ḥadīth} collections it would rarely be possible to say when the Prophet entered the Ka’ba and prayed. In \textit{sīra} and \textit{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-Hudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca,” 18. Also, Rosenthal: “\textit{Aḫbār} 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 Muhammad, and, in particular, the ancient Muslim authorities. . . . [\textit{Aḥbār}] became in fact something of a synonym of \textit{ḥadīṯ}.” Franz Rosenthal, \textit{A History of Muslim Historiography} (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 11.

\textsuperscript{149} Faizer, “Issue of Authenticity,” 101-2.
That al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Isḥāq is also argued by Gregor Schoeler who performed an isnād-cum-matn analysis on the story of the scandal involving ʿĀʾishah (i.e., ḥadīth al-īfāk). 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 Isḥāq, even as Ibn Isḥāq interpolated a tradition into the story.\textsuperscript{150} 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 Isḥāq who used the sources given in his isnād).\textsuperscript{151}

According to Schoeler, the scandal story probably goes back to ʿĀʾishah 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.\textsuperscript{152} 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 ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712).

The main objective of chapter 2 is to determine whether al-Wāqidī drew from without citing Ibn Isḥāq. Through a word-for-word comparison between the works of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Isḥāq, 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

\textsuperscript{150} Schoeler, Charakter, 138.

\textsuperscript{151} 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.

\textsuperscript{152} 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 Isḥāq, 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. The main manuscript upon which the edition is based (B.M. Or. 1617) is the only complete copy of the work known to exist. 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. According to Muslim traditional literature, Mūsā was a mawlā of Umm Khālid, the wife of al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām. A Medinan scholar and historian, Mūsā was known for his work on the Prophet’s maghāzī. He is said to have learned under al-Zuhrī, the master of Ibn Isḥāq, and unlike Ibn Isḥāq, Mūsā kept no relations with the ruling court. 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.” The connection to al-Zuhrī was also made by Mālik b. Anas. For his reputation, Mūsā was considered a reliable
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154 For Jones’s discussion of the various manuscripts utilized for his edition, see the preface to ibid., i:vii.
156 Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb al-tahdhib, 10:360.
157 In Mūsā’s case, the Umayyads. Horovitz, Earliest Biographies, 69.

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.’\footnote{Khayr alc-Dīn alc-Ziriklī, \textit{Al-JA’lam: qāmūs tarājim al-jashar al-janīl waj-lnisāʾ min al-ʿarāb wa-l-mustā’rab min wa-l-mustashriqān} (Cairo, 1959), 8:276; see Jones, “Maghāzī Literature,” 346.} Elsewhere, Mālik confirmed the reliability of Mūsā’s work: “You must hold to the maghāzī of Mūsā, for he is trustworthy.”\footnote{Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Tahdhīb al-Jahānīn}, 10:361.} In contrast, Mālik disparaged the work of the biographer’s junior contemporary Ibn Ḥishāq.\footnote{Ibid., 9:45.} Ibn Ḥanbal also regarded Mūsā’s work highly, esteeming it as trustworthy: ‘alaykum bi-maghāzī Ibn ‘Uqba fa-innahu thiqatun.\footnote{Khayr alc-Dīn alc-Ziriklī, \textit{Al-JA’lam: qāmūs tarājim al-jashar al-janīl waj-lnisāʾ min al-ʿarāb wa-l-mustā’rab min wa-l-mustashriqān} (Cairo, 1959), 8:276; see Jones, “Maghāzī Literature,” 346.} Ibn Sa’d for his \textit{Tabaqāt} included traditions of Mūsā, and al-Ṭabarī incorporated a number of Mūsā’s reports in his \textit{Ta’rikh}.

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\footnote{Jones comments on the chronological framework of the \textit{Maghāzī} of Mūsā b. ‘Uqba, Ibn Ishāq and al-Waqīqī: “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.} and not only included the life of the Prophet but also extended to the time of the Rashidūn and the first Umayyads.\footnote{Horovitz, \textit{Earliest Biographies}, 166–67; Joseph Schacht, “On Mūsā b. ‘Uqba’s Kitāb al-Maghāzī,” \textit{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 \textit{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, \textit{Narratives}, 220.} The latest traditions transmitted under Mūsā’s name pertain to the Battle of Ḥarra (63/683) and an event during the governorship of Khālid al-Qasrī
(91/710).\footnote{168} Such late traditions, according to Schoeler, were possibly transmitted by Mūsā outside of the Kitāb al-maghāzī.\footnote{169}

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.\footnote{170} 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.\footnote{171} The most important transmitter of Mūsā’s Kitāb, his nephew Ismā’īl b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uqba,\footnote{172} is believed by Schoeler to have transmitted the work as a whole.\footnote{173} Other transmitters of Mūsā’s work were Muḥammad b. Fulayḥ (d. 197/812-3)\footnote{174} and al-Fuḍayl b. Sulaymān (d. 185/801).\footnote{175}

According to Abbott, Mūsā’s Kitāb al-maghāzī was the first formal work of the Prophet’s campaigns,\footnote{176} drawing heavily on the collections of al-Zuhrī.\footnote{177} Al-Zuhrī’s material was then elaborated upon and augmented with other traditions.\footnote{178} The unfavorable assessment of the Kitāb al-maghāzī by al-Dhahabī considered it for the most part authentic but needful of explanation and supplementation.\footnote{179} Al-Dhahabī nonetheless deemed it the first systematically ordered work on the maghāzī and incorporated selections of it in his Kitāb al-ta’rīkh al-kašī.\footnote{180} 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
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traditions in which Nāfiʿ—i.e. the mawlā of ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar—who died in 118/736 or 119, is his informant.” Another distinguishing feature of Mūsā’s Maghāzī is its absence of personal judgments by Mūsā himself.

According to Jones, Mūsā did not make use of the full isnād. Instead, “[q]uotations from him are most frequently introduced by the phrase ‘Mūsā b. ʿUqbah 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. Kaʿb b. Mālik al-Sulamī and other traditionists.’” 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 ʿAbbās: “Kurayb left with us a camel load of the writings of Ibn ʿAbbās, and if Ibn ʿAbbās’s son ʿAlī wanted a manuscript, he asked in writing for the ṣaḥīfa to be sent to him, which was then copied out for him.” 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.” 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. 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

182 Jones, “Maghāzī Literature,” 350. Concerning the insertion of personal judgments, Jones says, “So far as we can tell, Mūsā b. ʿUqbah did not do this.” Jones goes on to say that “Ibn Iṣḥāq did it only seldom.”
183 Jones says of Mūsā, “[T]he conventional Ḥadīth-type isnād was in his case the exception rather than the rule.” Ibid., 348.
184 Ibid.
185 Ibn Saʿd, Ṭabaqāt, 5:216.
arbitrary and fanciful to conclude from this that Mūsā used a copy of the original document.”¹⁸⁸ In fact, Schacht extended his criticism to the entire biography of Mūsā.¹⁸⁹

The Works of Mūsā and Ibn Ishāq Compared

In Jones’s study of the raid to Nakhla and the vision of ʿĀtika, he argues that the works of Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā are greatly similar.¹⁹⁰ For the raid to Nakhla, Jones compares Ibn Ishāq’s material with the Kitāb al-magḥāzī 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. ʿUqba.”¹⁹¹ For the vision of ʿĀtika, Jones makes note of a remark by Ibn Kathīr,¹⁹² which observes the account of Mūsā to be similar to that of Ibn Ishāq.¹⁹³ 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-magḥāzī literature. From his study, Jones concludes that “the greater part of the sīra was already formalized by the second century A.H.”¹⁹⁴ 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.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁹ 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 Horovitz, 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 Shāfiʿī (d. 204).” Ibid., 300.
¹⁹⁰ Jones also remarks of the similarity between the works of Mūsā and al-Wāqidi: “Of the many works ascribed to al-Wāqidi by the bibliographers, his K. al-Magḥāzī is the only authenticated one to come down to us; it corresponds closely in structure and content to that of Mūsā b. ʿUqba...” Jones, “Magḥāzī Literature,” 346. See also Jones, “Muqaddima,” in al-Wāqidi, Kitāb al-magḥāzī, 1:24-25.
¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 51.
In addition to the similarities, differences of detail between the versions of Ibn Isḥāq and Mūsā are pointed out by Jones. For the raid to Nakhla, Mūsā’s version alone mentions Safwān b. Bayḍa’ and ʿĀmir 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 ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaḥsh to Nakhla are found exclusively in Ibn Isḥāq’s version. Moreover, whereas the version of Mūsā contains the narrative of Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and ʿUtba b. Ghazwān turning back from Buhrān while the others went on, the version of Ibn Isḥāq mentions only the poem within that narrative.196

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.”197 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. ʿUqbah.”198 Jones also asserts that although there is unanimous agreement among the sources on the dating of the Battle of Badr,199 other datings are often at variance between Mūsā and other historians.200 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 ʿĀm al-fil (The Year of the Elephant),

---

197 Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdīh al-tahdīh, 10:361.
198 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 Uhud. Schoeler also notes that Mūsā transmitted these lists from al-Zuhrī. Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 72n27.
199 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.
200 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‘īb al-Kalbī (d. 146/763)\textsuperscript{201} reported the event as fifteen years before ʿĀm al-fīl, and al-Zuhrī placed it as thirty years after ʿĀm al-fīl.\textsuperscript{202}

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.\textsuperscript{203} This Berlin “fragment” Ahlwardt No. 1552, otherwise known as the Muntakhab (Selection), is contained in a manuscript from the eighth/fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{204} 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.\textsuperscript{205} 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.\textsuperscript{206} In one instance in which the formula haddathanī al-Zuhrī is utilized, Horovitz understands that there was direct communication (al-Zuhrī narrated to me [Mūsā]) between the two.


\textsuperscript{202} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{204} The exact title is Ahādīth muntakhaba (Selected Traditions).


\textsuperscript{206} 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.\(^{207}\)

For Schacht, the contents of the Fragment’s traditions are of a kind expected of the middle of the second Islamic century.\(^{208}\) 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.”\(^{209}\) Other traditions “which seem to express an historical interest pure and simple, include longish, composite, romantic stories.”\(^{210}\) 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.”\(^{211}\) For Schacht, the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* in its original form did not contain traditions from authorities other than Zuhrī,\(^{212}\) and the traditions going back to al-Zuhrī themselves were falsely ascribed to him by Mūsā.\(^{213}\)

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*.\(^{214}\) In addition, Schacht noticed that the isnāds of parallel traditions in al-Bukhārī “spread” (i.e. fictitious names


\(^{209}\) Ibid., 290.

\(^{210}\) Ibid., 293.

\(^{211}\) Ibid., 300.

\(^{212}\) Ibid., 291.

\(^{213}\) Ibid., 292, 300.

\(^{214}\) Ibid., 294.
were added) from those of their counterpart in the Muntakhab. 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.” 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.

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.

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-Tayālisi, Ibn Sa’d, ʿAbd al-Razzaq and ʿUmar b. Shabba. Schoeler also points to the work of M. H. Salmān who followed in the line of Sachau but documented

---

216 Ibid., 299.
218 Donner, Narratives, 220.
219 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.\textsuperscript{220} 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.\textsuperscript{221}

Schoeler’s reexamination of the \textit{Muntakhab} assesses that Schacht was incorrect on a number of accounts. In the first place, Schoeler argues that a tradition in the \textit{Muntakhab} believed by Schacht to contain an anti-ʿAlid bias is in actuality free of tendentiousness.\textsuperscript{222} By referring to a parallel tradition in the work of al-Ṭayālisī, Schoeler suggests that two traditions that had been severed in the \textit{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-Ṭayālisī also demonstrates that Schacht’s assessment of fictitiousness of the other of the two traditions was incorrect. For Schoeler, since al-Ṭayālisī traces back to Mūsā in a divergent strand of transmission, the corresponding tradition in the \textit{Muntakhab} did in reality form part of Mūsā’s original book or was at least authentically transmitted on Mūsā’s authority.\textsuperscript{223}

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 \textit{isnāds}.\textsuperscript{224} Schoeler however, by referring to independent parallel traditions in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s \textit{Muṣannaf}—the parallel traditions are transmitted by ‘Abd al-Razzāq on the authority of Ma’mar b. Rāshid from al-Zuhrī—argues that the

\textsuperscript{220} Mashhūr Hasan Salmān, \textit{Aḥādīth muntakhaba min Maghāzī Mūsā b. ʿUqba} (Beirut, 1991).
\textsuperscript{222} Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 290. Guillaume asserts the lack of preference awarded to the ‘Alids: “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 \textit{Life of Muḥammad}, xlvii.
\textsuperscript{223} Schacht had assumed that only those traditions that Mūsā related on the authority of al-Zuhrī formed part of Mūsā’s original \textit{Kitāb al-magḥāzī}.
\textsuperscript{224} For a reply to Schacht, see Motzki, \textit{Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence}.\hfill\null
traditions in both the works of Mūsā and 'Abd al-Razzāq must go back to a common source, namely, al-Zuhri.\textsuperscript{225}

Schoeler goes further by arguing for the likelihood that a tradition in the \textit{Muntakhab} was genuinely transmitted by al-Zuhri’s teacher, ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr. This time Schoeler consults Ibn Abī Shayba’s \textit{Muṣannaf} from which he shows that a parallel tradition was independently transmitted by ‘Urwa through his son Hīshām 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.\textsuperscript{226}

Finally Schoeler argues for the untenability of Schacht’s belief in the presence of pro-‘Abbāsid traces in the \textit{Muntakhab}.\textsuperscript{227} According to Schoeler, parallel Mūsā-traditions to the purportedly biased one in the \textit{Muntakhab} make clear the absence of pro-‘Abbāsid bias by maintaining that Muḥammad refused to waive the ransom for his uncle who was captured at Badr.\textsuperscript{228} The earlier date of Mūsā’s death (d. 141/758) than that of Ibn Isḥāq (d. 150/767) and al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) is suggestive of Mūsā’s autonomy from the ‘Abbāsid 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 \textit{Dalā’il}.\textsuperscript{229} Given Schoeler’s discovery of the closeness in wording of a number of Mūsā-traditions between the \textit{Muntakhab} and the \textit{Dalā’il}, the \textit{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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnote}{225} Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 94.\end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{226} Ibid., 94-95.\end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{227} Schacht, “On Mūsā,” 290.\end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{228} Schoeler, “Mūsā,” 95.\end{footnote}
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. 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 ʿAbbāsid 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 Muʿāwiya, 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.” He asserts the near impossibility of reconstructing the historical events immediately following the death of ʿUthmān in 656 C.E.

---

230 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.


232 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.  

Tayeb El-Hibri also argues that the ‘Abbāsid 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. 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.” 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.

---

233 Petersen, ‘Ali and Muʿāwiya, 186.
235 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 ʿĀtika’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-Wāqidi’s dependence upon Ibn Ḥishāq. 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. The two selections were also made from the same larger maghāzī story as that of ʿĀtika’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. The three selections remained suitable as the study expanded to include the material ascribed to Mūsā and the material of Ibn Ḥishāq in the recensions of Ibn Hishâm and al-Ṭabarî.

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 ʿĀtika. 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 Ḥishāq (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-Wāqidi in chapter 2, for the question of al-Wāqidi’s dependence upon Ibn Ḥishāq is answered in the analysis of the three stories.

236 See pages 26-27 of the present study.
237 Included in the single combat story for this study is Ḥamza’s one-on-one encounter with al-Aswad.
CHAPTER 1

IBN ISḤĀQ AND ALTERATION

The examination of the Ibn Isḥāq-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,⁴⁴ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via al-Ṭabarī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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-Šiddiq arose and spoke well. Then Ṣumayr b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well. Then al-Miqdād b. Ḥaḍīth 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-Taba‘a, we would sit there.’”</td>
<td>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 Ṣumayr b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well. Then al-Miqdād b. Ḥaḍīth arose and said, “O messenger of God, proceed as God has commanded 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-Taba‘a, we would sit there.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²³⁸ 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. akfīyanakumūhu. Nevertheless the distinction between words and phrases offers the most efficiency in the categorization of the variants.


²⁴⁰ Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 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.

There are some indications that the Ibn Ḫishāq-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 Ḫishām vs. al-Ṭabarī]; and daʿā la-hu bi-hi vs. daʿā la-hu bi-khayri (7); and 2) two phrase-variants: la-ka vs. not present (5); and not present vs. yaʿnī madīnata l-ḥabashati (6).

The phrase yaʿnī madīnata l-ḥabashati (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. 242 Another edit seems to have been an alteration from arāka in Ibn


242 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 Hajār (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-Ṭabarî (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.243 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-Ṭabarî.

The Council of War—Section 2

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

244 Ibn Hishām, Al-Siṣra, 1:615.

245 Al-Ṭabarî, Taʾrikh, 3:1301.
When the Prophet said that, Sa‘d b. Mu‘ādh 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

Grammatical improvement in al-Ṭabarî 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-Ṭabarî, the Anṣār are described in the past tense by virtue of an additional word, kānū (were). Seeing as the narrative of al-Ṭabarî runs more smoothly, it appears that a transmitter in the line of al-Ṭabarî—Salama, Ibn Ḫumayd or al-Ṭabarî—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

---

246 Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣīra, 1:615.
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.”

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.”

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” (ناحنِناكَ). Secondly the account of al-Ṭabarī includes while that of Ibn Hishām does not the phrase (17): “with the blessing of God” (اللهْ بالرَّكَاة). In both cases, the two versions do not differ doctrinally, and neither version offers a superior reading.
Ibn Ishq (via Ibn Hisham)

Al-Aswas b. 'Abd al-Asad al-Makhzumī, 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, Hamza b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib came forth to him. When the two met, Hamza struck him and cut off his foot and half his leg before he reached the cistern. Al-Aswas 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.

Then after him Ṣutba 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 Ṭanṣār came out against him, and they were 'Awf and Mu'awwīd, the sons of al-Ḥārīth—their mother was 'Āfrā—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 Ṭanṣār.” They [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”

Ibn Ishq (via al-Ṭabarī)

Al-Aswas b. 'Abd al-Asad al-Makhzumī, 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-Aswas 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.

Then after him Ṣutba 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 Ṭanṣār came out against him, from the troop: 'Awf and Mu'awwīd, the sons of al-Ḥārīth—their mother was 'Āfrā—and another man, said to have been 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa. Then they [Quraysh] asked, “Who are you?” They answered, “Some of the Ṭanṣār,” whereupon they [Quraysh] said, “We have nothing to do with you.”
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>أَوْ لَا أَهْدِمُهُ</td>
<td>وَلَا هَدِمَهُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>نِعْمَهُ</td>
<td>نِعْمَهُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ثَلَاثَة وَهُمْ</td>
<td>ثَلَاثَة وَهُمْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>يَقُولُ</td>
<td>يَقُولُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>هُوَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ</td>
<td>عبد الله بن رواحة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>فَقَالُوا</td>
<td>قَالَوا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>فَقَالُوا</td>
<td>قَالَوا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>فَقَالُوا</td>
<td>قَالَوا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)

Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥarīth, and arise, O Ḥāmza, 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, “ʿAlī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.” ‘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.

Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarî)

Then their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribe!” The Prophet said, “Arise, O Hamza b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, and arise O ‘Ubayda b. al-Ḥarīth, 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, “ʿAlī.” They said, “Yes, noble peers.” ‘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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>قَمْ بِعَبْدِكُمُ الْمُطَّلِبِ</th>
<th>قَمْ بِحَرَّمَةَ بَنِي عِيْلَبَ</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarî)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>قَمْ بِعَبْدِكُمُ الْمُطَّلِبِ</td>
<td>Qum bi-ʿAbdikum al-muttalib</td>
<td>Qum bi-ḥaramat bani ʿEylab</td>
<td>Qum bi-ʿAbdikum al-muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Qum bi-ʿAbdikum al-muttalib</td>
<td>Qum bi-ḥaramat bani ʿEylab</td>
<td>Qum bi-ʿAbdikum al-muttalib</td>
<td>Qum bi-ḥaramat bani ʿEylab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>عَبْدَةُ</td>
<td>عَبْدَةُ</td>
<td>Qum bi-ʿAbdikum al-muttalib</td>
<td>Qum bi-ḥaramat bani ʿEylab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa by both Ḥamza and ʿAlī. Previously stated is the sentence fa-dhaffafāʿalayhi, or “Then they [Ḥamza and ʿAlī] dispatched him [ʿUtba].” This previous sentence may have had the effect of making unclear the killing of ʿUtba, 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 ʿUbayda, 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 ʿĀtika—Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ʿIkrima from Ibn ʿAbbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and they both said: Three days before Ḍāmḍām arrived in Mecca, ʿĀtika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd 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 254 Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣira, 1:607-8. 255 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1292-93. | Ibn Ḥumayd related to me that Salama said that Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ʿIkrima from Ibn ʿAbbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and he said: Three days before Ḍāmḍām arrived in Mecca, ʿĀtika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd 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 255 Edward William Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, s.v. "ثلف,"
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 among dwellings 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.”

### Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>قال</td>
<td>said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>عمي</td>
<td>blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>أنباطك به</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>إلا</td>
<td>except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>يا للنَّ سُبْحَان</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>قال</td>
<td>said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>عمي</td>
<td>blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>أنباطك به</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>إلا</td>
<td>except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>يا للنَّ سُبْحَان</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


257 Ibid.
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 šarakha 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 šarakha bi-a’lā šawtihi 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 šawtihi, 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-ʿAbbās] 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 šawtihi).

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 ʿĀtika continues her narration. An extra phrase in al-Ṭabarī, min ṑuriḥā (9), again brings about uniformity to the account:

mā baqiya baytun min buyūtin makka wa-lā dār ilā dakhalathā minḥā 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 ṑuriḥā ilā dakhalathā minḥā 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.
Al-ʿAbbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-ʿAbbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ʿUtba, and the story spread in Mecca until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings.

Al-ʿAbbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Kaʿba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ʿĀtika’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 ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “That vision which ʿĀtika saw.” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: Then I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?!” ʿĀtika 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 Kaʿba among the Arabs.”

Al-ʿAbbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-ʿAbbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ʿUtba, and the story spread until Quraysh were talking about it.

Al-ʿAbbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Kaʿba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ʿĀtika’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-ʿAbbās]: So when I finished, I went to him and sat with them. Abū Jahl asked, “O Banū ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “The vision that ʿĀtika saw.” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy?!” ʿĀtika 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 Kaʿba among the Arabs.”


Al-Ṭabarānī, Taʿrīkh, 3:11293.
A couple pieces of evidence that show that the Ibn Ishāq-material in al-Ṭabarī’s recension was reconstructed involve the scene after ʿĀṭika shared the content of her vision with al-ʿAbbās. According to Ibn Hishām’s recension, the story of her vision spread in Mecca (fashā ʿl-hadīthu bi-makka) (10) until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings (ḥattā tahaddathā bi-hi Quraysh fī andiytiḥā) (11). In al-Ṭabarī’s recension however, bi-makka and fī andiytiḥā are absent; as a result the account relates that the story spread (fashā ʿl-hadīthu) until Quraysh were talking about it (ḥattā tahaddathā 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 ʿĀṭika was being discussed by Quraysh the morning after ʿĀṭika 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-ʿAbbās 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 ʿĀtika—Section 3

Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)

He [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.”

On the third day after ʿĀtika’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-ʿAbbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-ʿAbbās] 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-ʿAbbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of Ḍamḍam b. Ṭām al-Ghīfārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel’s nose,

Ibn Isḥāq (via al-Ṭabarī)

He [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.”

On the third day after ʿĀtika’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-ʿAbbās] 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-ʿAbbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of Ḍamḍam b. Ṭām al-Ghīfārī who was shouting in the valley as he stood on his camel. He had cut off his camel’s nose,

260 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:609.
261 Al-Ṭabarī, Tarikh, 3:1294–95.
turned his saddle around, and tore 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.

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.

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>上下游</th>
<th>Adv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>لا أفينا</td>
<td>أن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>أما</td>
<td>فلت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>من</td>
<td>من</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-Ṭabarî. 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 ʿĀtika’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 ʿĀtika’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 Isḥāq.

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.\textsuperscript{262} The table shows that the large majority of the reports by Ibn Isḥāq 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 ʿUbayda b. al-Ḥārith (152)
2. The poem of ʿUmayr b. al-Humām (171)
3. The burial of Abū Lahab (342)
4. Al-ʿAbbās in prison (343)
5. The capture of al-ʿAbbās (344)
6. The ransom of al-ʿAbbās (362)
7. The excusal of Saʿd b. Muʿādh from a purported punishment (484)

Already mentioned was Ibn Hishām’s omission of three of the reports (343, 344, 362) due to his pro-ʿAbbāsid bias.\textsuperscript{263} 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.

\textsuperscript{262} The table is found on pages 73-100 of the present study.
\textsuperscript{263} 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.264 The poems usually redound to the glory of an individual Muslim warrior. An example is the poem ascribed to al-Mujadhdhur (205), who is reported to have killed Abū al-Bakhtārī:

Did you not know or did you forget my lineage?  
Take note of my lineage, that I am from Balī,  
those who thrust with Yazzānī spears,  
striking the chief until he is leaned over.  
Tell the orphan, the one whose father is al-Bakhtārī,  
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 Mashrawī sword.  
I am ready for death like a camel overfull with milk.  
You will not see Mujadhadhur 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:265

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 ʿĀmir (27)  
2. The poem of Ṭālib b. Abī Ṭālib (87)  
3. The poem of Ṭulayḥa b. Khuwaylid al-Asadī concerning his slaying of ʿUkkāsha (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. ʿUtba (420)  
11. The poem of Kināna b. al-Rabī (421)

264 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.

265 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 Rifa’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.\footnote{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.} 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):

\begin{center}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via al-Ṭabarī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Isḥāq said: ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr told me that Mālik b. Rabī’a one of Banū Sāʿīda</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:642.}
from Abū Usayd al-Sā‘idī said: “I got a sword belonging to Banū ‘Aidh the Makhzumite 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.

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):

---

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)[268]  
Ibn Ishāq said: Miḥja’ the mawlah 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.” . . .

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

---

Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī)[269]  
He [Ibn Ishāq] said: Miḥja’ the mawlah 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 (wa naffala kullā imra’īn minhum mā āṣābā). 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.” . . .

Then the Prophet ordered that what the men gathered in the camp be brought together. The Muslims disagreed concerning that. Those who had

---

268 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:627, 641.
269 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrkh, 3:1321, 1333.
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.” . . .
collected something said, “It is ours. The Prophet had promised that we could keep what we took (qad kāna rasūlu llāhu ṣallā llāhu ʿalayhi wajsallam naffala kulla imra in minhum mā așṣaba).” 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.” . . .

Thus the report of Muḥammad's order to turn in the spoils was omitted from al-Ṭabarī’s recension in order 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-Aswād:

---

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 Mukhrī', 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:

---

270 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:657.
In sum, while the large majority of the reports by Ibn Isḥāq 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 one recension 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 Isḥāq-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.

---

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) - Muhammad’s Summon of the Muslims to Attack the Meccan Caravan Led by Abū Sufyān

The Vision of ʿĀtika

Ibn Hishām - ʿĀtika

The Preparation of Quraysh in Mecca and the State of War between Quraysh and Banū Bakr

The Cause of War between Quraysh and Banū Bakr

The war between Quraysh and Banū Bakr, according to what one of Banū ʿĀmir b. Luʾayy from Muḥammad b. Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab told me, had to do

---

274 Ibn Hishām, Al-Šīrāzī, 3:1292-95.
275 Ibn Hishām, Al-Šīrāzī, 3:1296.
276 Ibn Hishām, Al-Šīrāzī, 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. ʿĀmir b. Layth b. Bakr b. Abd 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
morning, Quraysh saw the sword of ʿĀmir b. Yazīd b. ʿAmīr hanging on the curtains of the Kaʿba and recognized it. They said, “This is the sword of ʿĀmir 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.

The Procession of the Muslims to Badr

When I saw that it was ʿAmir, I remembered the lifeless corpse of my dear brother. I said to myself, “It is ʿĀmir, 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.

The Guarantee by Iblīs in the Form of Surāqa b. Mālik that Banū Kināna will not Attack the Meccans from the Rear

He [Muḥammad] handed over the standard to Mūṣʿab b. ʿUmayr b. Hāshim b. Ṭālib b. Ṭalib al-Dār. In front of the Prophet were two black flags, one with Ṭalib b. Ṭālib called al-Uqāb and the other with one of the Ansār. On that day the companions of

---

277 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:611-12.
278 Ibid., 612; al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1296.
the Prophet had seventy camels which they took turns riding. The Prophet, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, and Marthad b. Abī Marthad al-Ghanawī took turns on one camel; Ḥamza b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, Zayd b. Ḥāritha, Abū Kabsha, and Anasa, mawlā of the Prophet, took turns on another camel; and Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿAbd al-Rahman b. ʿAwf on one camel.

The Muslims’ Route to Badr and their Confrontation with a Nomad

He took the mountainous road from Medina to Mecca; then he went through al-ʿAqīq, Dhū al-Ḥulayfa, and Īlāt al-Jaysh. Then he passed Turbān, Malal, and Ghāmis al-Ḥamām from Marayayn; then Ṣukhayrāt al-Yamām, Sayāla; then the passage [between the mountains] of al-Rawḥā, and Shanūkā, which is the direct route, until at ʿIrq 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. Ṣalāma b. Waqṣh 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.

The Prophet stopped at Sajṣaj, which is the well of al-Rawḥā; he departed from it and when he was at al-Musansaraf, he left the Meccan road on the left and went to the right to al-Ḥāziyya, making for Badr. He entered its area and crossed a wādī called Ruhqān, which is between al-Ḥāziyya and the pass of al-Ṣafra; then he went on the pass. Afterwards, he set forth from it.

280 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:613.
Muḥammad’s Dispatch of Scouts and his Evil Omen at Ṣafrāʾ

The Council of War

Muḥammad’s Inquiry of an Old Bedouin Man of the Whereabouts of Quraysh and the Muslims

The Muslims’ Capture and Interrogation of the Water-Carriers of Quraysh

Basbas and Adīy’s Discovery of the Caravan’s Time of Arrival at Badr and Abū Sufyān’s Discovery of the Muslims’ Presence

٧٨

283 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:616; al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1303.
The Poem of Ṭālib b. Abī Ṭālib

87 O God, if Ṭālib 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.

The Muslims’ Stopping Up of the Wells and their Construction of Muḥammad’s Booth

88 The Dream of Juhaym and Abū Jahl’s Determination to Reach Badr

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

The Counsel of Utba b. Rabī’āʾ

103

104


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>偃</th>
<th>在于一层</th>
<th>他们称</th>
<th>望楼</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
<th>曾经</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abū Jahl’s Rejection of Utba’s Counsel**

1. فاطرته أطر أيا جهل
2. في حبة أطر أبا جهل
3. فيه محمد باب ردته
4. في حب أمر الناس
5. في حبة عبادة
6. في علم الله وسبره

**Single Combat**

1. أو الله وليه
2. أو له
3. وأم الزمان
4. والجاهزة
5. إلى الله
6. هو عبد الله بن رواحة
7. قالوا
8. قالوا
9. قالوا
10. قالوا
11. قالوا
12. قالوا
13. فما يا حمزة بن عبد المطلب، فما يا عبد بن
14. فأدعاه باب طالب
15. فما يا علي
16. فما يا عبد بن
17. فما يا علي
18. فما يا عبد بن

---

The Martyrdom of 'Ubaydah b. al-Hārith

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 Ṭālīb 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

The Poem of ‘Umayr b. al-Ḥumām

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

---

293 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, 3:1318.
295 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, 3:1321.
The Poem of al-Mujaddidhar

205 Did you not know or did you forget my lineage?
Take note of my lineage, that I am from Balî,
those who thrust with Yazânî spears,
striking the chief until he is leaned over.
Tell the orphan, the one whose father

208 Ibn Hishâm, Al-Šīrâ, 1:630.
is al-Bakhtari,
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 Mashrafi sword.
I am ready for death like a camel overfull with milk.
You will not see Mujadhidhār telling a lie.

The Death of Umayya b. Khalaf

The Fighting by Angels at Badr

Abū Usayd’s Knowledge of the Location from where the Angels Emerged

Abū Allāh b. Abū Bakr from one of Banū Sā‘ida from Abū Usayd Mālik b. Rabī‘a who was present at Badr said,

301 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."

The Poem of Abū Jahl

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.

Muhammad's Miraculous Turning of a
Stick into a Sword for 'Ukkāsha

'Ikkāsha b. Mihšan b. Ḥurthān al-
Asadi, 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
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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.
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عَشَّ عَشَّ الْأَمَامُ

Muhammad’s Miraculous Turning of a
Stick into a Sword for ‘Ukkāsha

'Ikkāsha b. Mihšan b. Ḥurthān al-
Asadi, 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

304

Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:634.

304

Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:634.
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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-Asadi killed him.

The Poem of Ṭulayḥa b. Khuwaylid al-Asadi Concerning his Slaying of ʿUkkāsha

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 Hibāl. I raised against them the breast of Himāla, 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 Aqrām alive and ʿUkkāsha the Ghanmite on the field.

Muḥammad’s Prayer for ʿUkkāsha; ʿUkkāsha as the Best Muslim Horseman

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-ʿAzwar al-Asadī said, “That

Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣīra, 1:637.
Ibid., 638.
is a man of ours O messenger of God.
The Prophet answered, “He is not yours but ours through alliance.”

Muhammad and the Meccan Dead in the Pit

The Poem of Hassān b. Thābit

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 Muhammad, 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.

---

And the command of God takes hold of
was right."

You were correct and your judgment
was right.”

The messenger of God called to them
when we dispatched all of them into
the well.

“We have found my words to be true?
And the command of God takes hold of
the heart?”

They spoke not. If they had spoken,
they would have said,
“You were correct and your judgment
was right.”

The Revelation of the Qurʾān Concerning Some Meccans Killed at Badr

The Qurʾān 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-Uzza
b. Quṣayy: al-Ḥārith b. Zama’a b. al-
Aswad b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib; from Banū
Makhzūm: Abū Qays b. al-Fākīh b. al-
Mughūra b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b.
Makhzūm; from Banū Jumaḥ: ‘Alī b.
Umayya b. Khalaf b. Wahb b. Ḥudhāfa
b. Jumaḥ; and from Banū Sahm: al-‘Ās
b. Munabbih b. al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘Āmir b.
Ḥudhayfa b. Sa’d b. Sahm. 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

---

309 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:641.
Ibn Ishāq said: 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr told me that Mālik b. Rabīʿa, one of Banū Sāʿida from Abū Usayd alc-Sāʿidī said: “I got a sword belonging to Banū ʿĀidh 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.
God has given victory and Akhnas has run away.

- Al-Tabarî, Th. 3133; Watt notes: "Ibn Isḥāq 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, Al-Jīra, 42, 3:1335; Watt notes, "Ibn Isḥāq 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."
The Burial of Abū Lahab

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-ʿAbbās in Prison

According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama b. Faḍl—Muḥammad b. Ishāq—al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās: 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-ʿAbbās writhing in his chains.” So they left to al-ʿAbbās and released his chains, and the Prophet went to sleep.

The Capture of al-ʿAbbās

According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama b. Faḍl—Muḥammad b. Ishāq—al-Ḥasan

---

116 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīḵ, 3:1340-41.
117 Ibid., 1341.
118 Ibid..
You capture alcʿAbbās, O Abū alc
and alcʿAbbās was a bulky man. The
noble angle helped you against him.”

345
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348
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352
353
354
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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.

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.

120 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:649.
121 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-ʿAbbās

According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama—Muhammad b. Ishāq—al-Kalbī—Abū Ṣāliḥ—Ibn ʿAbbās: The Prophet said to al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib when he was brought to Medina, “O al-ʿAbbās, ransom yourself, your two nephews, ʿAqīl b. Abī Ṭālib and Nawfal b. al-Ḥārith, and your ally, ʿUtba b. ʿAmr b. Jaḥdām, the brother of Banū al-Ḥārith b. Fihr, 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 (āqīyya) of gold from him, and al-ʿAbbās 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 ʿAbd Allāh, so much is for Qutham, and so much is for ʿUbayd 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-ʿAbbās ransomed himself, his two nephews, and his ally.

Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1344-45.
Hassān b. Thābit’s Answer to Abū Sufyān

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.

Zaynab’s Departure to Medina
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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.
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Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīrā, 1:651.
Ibid., 653-57; al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, 3:1348-50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>برك حموها كاناثة مثأك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>علانية من علانية من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>علانية من علانية من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قال فعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قالفعل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>علانية على روع الناس من عن مصبتنا ونكبتنا عن أبيها عن أباه من حاجة هذا الصوت قالفعل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Poem of the Affair of Zaynab**

Abū ʿAbd 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 Damdam. From our war he was spited and remorsed. We bound his son ʿAmr 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 ʿĀd 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.”

---

*ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:655-56.*
Abū Sufyān’s sworn client was ʿĀmir b. al-Ḥaḍramī who was among the prisoners. An ally of al-Ḥaḍramī was Harb b. Umeya.

The Poem of Hind d. ʿUtba

When those who had gone to Zaynab returned, Hind d. ʿUtba 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-Rabiʿ

Kināna b. al-Rabiʿ 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 Muhammad. 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

Yazīd b. Abū Ḥaib—Bukayr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ashajj—Sulaymān b. Yasār—Abū Isḥāq 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-Aswād 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-ʿĀṣ b. al-Rabiʿ

326 Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣira, 1:656.
327 Ibid., 656-57.
328 Ibid., 657.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>427</th>
<th>إفآء</th>
<th>قالوا</th>
<th>عليك قال فردوه</th>
<th>ماهو حتي بالحبل</th>
<th>فنتا</th>
<th>على التكاح</th>
<th>شينا بعد ست سنين</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>قالوا</td>
<td>فناوا</td>
<td>فرنوه</td>
<td>حتي</td>
<td>بالنداو</td>
<td>فنا</td>
<td>على التكاح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Freedom without Payment of Some Meccan Prisoners[^10]

Among the prisoners who, I was told, were freed without paying ransom were: from Banū 'Abd Shams b. 'Abd Manāf: Abū al-ʿĀṣ b. al-Rabī b. 'Abd al-Uzza b. 'Abd Shams, who the Prophet freed after Zaynab, the daughter of the Prophet, had sent his ransom; from Banū Makhzūm: al-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥantab b. al-Ḥārith b. 'Ubaydā 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 Sayfī b. Abū Rifa‘a b. ʿĀbid b. ʿĀbd Allāh b. ʿUmar 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.

[^10]: Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīrā, 1:659-60.

[^31]: AljSīra

[^32]: Ibid., 660.

[^33]: Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīrā, 1:659-60.
him again.

The Poem of Abū 'Azza

Abū 'Azza said, praising the Prophet and mentioning his kindness among his people:
Who will get hold of the messenger Muhammad, 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.  

The Conversion of 'Umayr b. Wahb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لسماً من المسلمين في المسجد</th>
<th>إناً على باب</th>
<th>والله ما حاء</th>
<th>كنا</th>
<th>أتاروا عليه من هذا الخبر</th>
<th>ساءف في عنقه</th>
<th>فقال</th>
<th>لحديث عيده بها</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>في الحجر بيسير</td>
<td>وكان من</td>
<td>هو</td>
<td>بعدم خير</td>
<td>قال</td>
<td>قال</td>
<td>في أعظمها</td>
<td>صفوان</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | | | | صفوان بن أبيه | أمير | من أمير

333 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:660.
334 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.
335 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:661-64; al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1352-54.
Umayr 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 Surāqā?” 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 Surāqā b. Mālik Jušhum 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
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.

Another Poem of Ḥassān b. Thābit

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.

The Excusal of Saʿd b. Muʿādh from a Purported Punishment

According to Ibn Ḥumayd—Salama—Muḥammad b. Ishāq: When this verse
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’ādh, 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 Isḥāq. 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 Isḥāq’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 Isḥāq is maintained (Examples of such minor variants are synonyms and variations in word order). A stronger indicator that Wāqidī drew from Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq-material, the recension of Ibn Hishām is utilized, since the previous chapter discovered the Ibn Isḥāq-material in the recension of al-Ṭabarī to have undergone some alterations. Nevertheless, the two recensions are nearly identical, and the variants of the Ibn Isḥāq-material from the recension of al-Ṭabarī are footnoted

\[\text{For a summary, see pages 66-67 of the present study.}\]
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 Isḥāq corresponds substantially in content with al-Wāqidī’s version. By comparison, most other sources contain one, two, or sometimes three of the sections. Moreover, the storyline and chronology in Ibn Isḥāq 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, another source excludes al-Miqdād from the council. Also, the sequence of the council in one source is in line with al-Wāqidī by having al-Miqdād give counsel prior to Saʿd b. Muʿād, yet the order is reversed elsewhere. A divergence of major significance has Muḥammad convene the counsel under a different circumstance than that in al-Wāqidī. Therefore due to close correspondences in content, storyline and chronology, Ibn Isḥāq’s version comes nearest in similarity to al-Wāqidī’s version. Given these resemblances, one already begins to suspect that al-Wāqidī drew his council story from his predecessor.

---

342 ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Muṣannaf, 5:350, no. 9727.
346 Given the vast array of sources in Islamic historiography, the possibility of the existence of another source more similar than Ibn Isḥāq 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 Ḩishām (via Ibn Hishām) 437

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-Ṣiddiq arose and spoke well. Then ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.

Al-Wāqūḍī 438

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 ʿUmar arose and spoke well.

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-Wāqiḍī includes an additional title and its associated honorific of Muḥammad (3), and the version of Ibn Ḩishām includes an extra preposition (2), the appellation for Abū Bakr (4), and the family name of ʿUmar (5). The only significant difference between the texts is a sentence found solely in the version of al-Wāqiḍī (1). Since this sentence was most probably inserted by al-

---

439 “Fāṣistahī rabbī ʿalāhi wa ṣallā li-Wāqūḍī, Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrikh, 3:1300.
440 Abu Bakr ṣalāmah. Ibid.
441 “Faqal Faḥsun. Ibid.
442 “Faqal Faḥsun. 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 Iṣḥāq for his version of the story.

The Council of War—Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Iṣḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

"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."

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

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.

354 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, 3:107.
355 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:615.
357 Al-Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, 3:1300.
Al-Wäqidi probably drew from Ibn Ishāq for this passage. Although the text of al-Wäqidi 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-Wäqidi’s narrative echoes that of Ibn Ishāq (via al-Ṭabarī) concerning God’s command (1). Moreover the texts of al-Wäqidi 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-Wäqidi’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

---

358 Al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, 3:1300.
359 Ibid.
360 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:615.
361 Al-Wäqidi, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:48.
people, and because when they had pledged allegiance to him at al-ʿAqaba, 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.

not help him except in their territory and that they had stipulated to protect him from that which they protected themselves and their children.

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)

And also that they had sworn an oath to him when they came to him, and he had promised them protection. He said: “We have no intention of going against them unless they attack you.”

Al-Wāqidi

And also that Anṣār had sworn an oath to him when they came to him, and he had promised them protection. He said: “We have no intention of going against them unless they attack you.”

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.

363 إِذَا وَصَلَت إِلَى دَيْرَانَا إِذَا وَصَلَت إِلَى دَيْرَانَا. Ibid.
364 ذِمَامَة. Ibid.
365 أَنْ لا أَذِمَامَة. Ibid.
366 نُصْرُكَهُ. Ibid.
Although al-Waqidi’s version appears to be a summary of Ibn Ishāq’s version, the shortness of al-Waqidi’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)367

When the Prophet said that, Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh 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.”

Al-Waqidi368

The Prophet said, “Give me advice!” Then Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh 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.”

367 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:615.
368 Al-Waqidi, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:48-49.
369 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrikh, 3:1302.
370 Ibid.
The presence of literal and non-literary 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-literary parallels are:

1. Sa'd b. Mu'ādh 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.

---

371. Al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, 3:1302.
372. Ibid.
c. the Anšār are not unwilling to meet the enemy tomorrow.
d. the Anšār 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-Wāqīdī 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-Wāqīdī.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Wāqīdī</th>
<th>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Si gnificantly the extra sentence in al-Wāqīdī 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 badā’, a theology greatly stressed by the Shīʿa in which the emergence of new circumstances causes a change in an earlier divine ruling.374

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.

---

374 Et, s.v. “badā‘.”
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 Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh, 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.

375 Al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:49.
The Council of War—Section 7

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.”

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām): 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.”

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām): 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.”

For this passage, there are two identical sentences (3 & 4 [via al-Ṭabarî]), and the differences between the versions are minor, suggesting the feasibility that al-Wāqīḍi 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-Wāqīḍi who, after his inclusion of the previous individual report, returned to narrating the council story in the manner of the combined report technique. Consequently the differences at the beginning of the passage are not useful for comparison in answering the question of dependence.

---

376 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:615.
377 Al-Wāqīḍi, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:49.
378 Ibid. on Būkārā’s account, Al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rīkh, 3:1302.
379 Al-Wāqīḍi, Al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rīkh, 3:1402.
380 In al-Wāqīḍi, Muhammad’s delight at the words of Sa’d is already provided in the previous individual report. Probably al-Wāqīḍi saw no need to repeat the account and omitted it when constructing the present report.
Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)\(^{181}\)

**Al-Wāqīḍī**\(^{182}\)

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. Hamzā 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. Hamzā 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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqīḍī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>وقد خرج وعَرَى هذا الناس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>وكان رجلا شرسا سيء الخلق</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>فَلَمْ خرج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>أَعَاهَ اللهُ لَأَشَرَّينَ مِن حوضِهِمْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>وَلَأَمْوَتْنَ دَوْنَهُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>فَلا تَشَبَّهَوهُ السَّمَّاء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>وَهُوَ دُونُ الحَوْضِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>فَبَشَّرَهُ بِحَمْزَةٍ قَاطِنُ قَدْمَهُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>كُلُّ حَيْبَةٍ لِلَّهِمَّةِ مُؤْتَمَّ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>فَلَمْ حَيْبَةٍ لِلَّهِمَّةِ مُؤْتَمَّ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{182}\) Al-Wāqīḍī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:68.


\(^{184}\) Ibid.

\(^{185}\) زعم أنَّ ibid., 1317.
| 12 | فضريه في الحوض قَتَله، حتى قَتَله في الحوض والمشروكون ينظرون على صفوفهم وهم يرون آلههم ظاهرون. فذنا الناس بعضهم من بعض. |
| 13 | Not present |
| 14 | قَتَله في الحوض |

A general indication that al-Wāqidi 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-Wāqidi’s activity in abridging Ibn Ishāq’s narrative, and one of the variants (1) was most probably created by al-Wāqidi 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-Wāqidi’s version, but al-Aswad accomplished neither in Ibn Ishāq’s version. Al-Wāqidi possibly drew al-Aswad’s demolition of the cistern (10) from Mūsā, whose version in al-Bayhaqi’s Dalā’il reports similarly: hadama minhu.\(^\text{186}\) As for the excerpt exclusively in al-Wāqidi in which the

\(^{186}\) Al-Bayhaqi, 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

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

A further difference affects the storyline. Of the three Meccans, ʿUtba, according to the version of Ibn Isḥāq, 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 (daʿā) the challenge for single combat (2, 3). In al-Wāqīdī however, a chief antagonist is lacking. As the verbs faṣalū and daʿū 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-Wāqīdī.

It seems that al-Wāqīdī was concerned to add “knowledge” to text of Ibn Isḥāq. In the identification of the three Anṣārīs who met the challenge for single combat, al-Wāqīdī 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). Concerning al-Wāqīdī’s references to the sons of ʿAfrāʾ and Banū al-Ḥārith (5), it

394 Al-Wāqīdī made pronouncements on the trustworthiness of a tradition. See Cook, Muhammad, 63–64. Cf. a report about al-Wāqīdī 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 Isḥāq on maternity. The remainder of the passage in Ibn Isḥāq, the dialogue between the Meccans and the Anṣārīs (8), is lacking in al-Wāqīḍī. In its place is a tradition (see Section 3) that conversely is non-existent in Ibn Isḥāq.

Single Combat—Section 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq</th>
<th>Al-Wāqīḍī⁹⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Wāqīḍī</th>
<th>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)⁹⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.”</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

⁹⁵ Al-Wāqīḍī, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:68.

Then the representative of the polytheists shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth to us peers from your tribe.” The Prophet said to them, “O Banū Ḥāshim, 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. Abī 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.”

Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) 118

Al-Wāqīḍi

| 1 | Al-Wāqīḍi
|---|---
| 2 | Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)
| 3 | Al-Wāqīḍi
| 4 | Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)
| 5 | Al-Wāqīḍi

Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:625.


Al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, 3:1317.

Ibid.

Ibn al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, 3:1317.

Ibn al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, 3:1317.
Al-Waqidi’s version is approximately twice the length of Ibn Isḥāq’s version. Although the sequence of events in both versions is the same, the additional material in al-Waqidi maintains a significant amount of divergences from the narrative in Ibn Isḥāq to either reflect a different tradition or show al-Waqidi’s activity in expanding Ibn Isḥāq’s narrative. The following characterizations are uniquely of al-Waqidi’s version:

1. The Prophet incited the Banū Hāshim with a kerygmatic utterance (4).  
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” (7) while Utba spoke on behalf of the Meccans and offered his own designation as “the lion of the Allies.”

Notably al-Waqidi’s version may exhibit a sign of reedition. 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 Muhammad ordered to rise and fight. The tradition’s “foreknowledge” may be evidence that its composer rearranged an already existent tradition.

Single Combat—Section 5

---

402 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.

403 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.

404 Al-Waqidi, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:69.
The report is found exclusively in the version of al-Wāqidī, who sought to elucidate the meaning of “the Allies” (al-hulafā’). 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)405

‘Ubayda was the eldest of them, and he faced ‘Utba b. Rab‘a, while Ḥamza faced Shayba b. Rab‘a and ‘Alī faced al-Walīd b. ‘Utbā. 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 Ṭalīb 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.”]

Al-Wāqidī406

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.” He said, “Now then by God, if Abū Ṭalīb were alive, then he would know that I was right in what he said when he uttered: You lied, by the house of God, when you said, “We will give up Muhammad.” 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.”

405 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:625.
406 Al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:69–70.
The two versions share three motifs: 1) the single combat duels; 2) the martyrdom of Ubayda (via al-Ṭabarî); and 3) the poetic verse uttered by Ubayda (via al-Ṭabarî). Of the two, al-Wāqidi’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-Wāqidi’s
version however, the duels are animated and progressively play out one at a time.
Secondly, the manner in which ʿUbayda received his fatal injury is illustrated in vivid
detail in al-Wāqīdī (1), but the colorful episode is absent in Ibn Isḥāq. In all likelihood
the animation of the duels and the liveliness with which they are recounted in the
version of al-Wāqīdī are hallmarks of the storyteller.

If al-Wāqīdī’s account is stripped of its storyteller elements, then it may appear
that the two versions are one and the same, indicating al-Wāqīdī’s dependence upon
Ibn Isḥāq. 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 Isḥāq, Ḥamza is paired with Shayba, and ʿUbayda is
paired with ʿUtba. Yet in al-Wāqīdī, Ḥamza is paired with ʿUtba, and ʿUbayda is paired
with Shayba. As a matter of fact, the pairings by al-Wāqīdī match those in Mūsā’s
version in al-Bayhaqī’s Dalāʾʾīl:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqīdī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then the tribe of their uncle arose against them. Ḥamza b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib arose as well as ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Ṭālib and ʿUbayda b. al-Ḥārith b. al-Muṭṭalib. Ḥamza faced ʿUtba, ʿUbayda faced Shayba, and ʿAlī faced al-Walid. Then Ḥamza slew ʿUtba, ʿUbayda slew Shayba, and ʿAlī slew al-Walid. Shayba struck the leg of ʿUbayda and amputated it. Ḥamza and ʿAlī rescued him, and he was carried until he died due to the [loss of] bile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The Vision of ʿĀtika

For the analysis, the story of ʿĀtika’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 ʿĀtika—Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqīdī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ishāq said: A person I do not distrust, on the authority of ʿIrāma from Ibn ʿAbbās, and Yazīd b. Rūmān from Urwa b. al-Zubayr, told me, and they both said: Three days before ʿAmr b. ʿĀdīm arrived in Mecca, ʿĀtika saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd 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.” She 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, come forth to your destruction in three days’ time.’ I saw the people gather around him; then</td>
<td>They said: ʿĀtika d. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, before [the arrival of] ʿAmr b. ʿĀdīm, saw a vision which frightened her and caused agony in her heart. She sent for her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, 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 Kaʿba, he shouted the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 among dwellings in Mecca that a piece did not enter.”

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 nor a dwelling among dwellings in Mecca that a piece did not enter.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>قبل قوم ضمّة عربو</td>
<td>قبل ضمّة عربو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثلاث ثلاث</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أزعتها</td>
<td>فأزعتها، وعظمت في صردها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فيعتها</td>
<td>فأزعتها، وعظمت في صردها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بن عبد المطلب</td>
<td>فارست</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

413. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1292.
415. Al-Tabarî, Al-Tâhâ al-Tamâm, 1:293.
418. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1293.
419. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1293.
421. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1293.
422. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1293.
423. Al-Tabarî, Ta’rîh, 3:1293.
The large number of literal parallels (7a, 9a, 10a, 11, 11a, 12a, 14a, 15, 15a, 16a, 16b, 17a) demonstrates that al-Wāqīdī 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-Wāqīdī’s version lacks a number of phrases and sentences (2, 7, 9, 10, 14) that are present in Ibn Ishāq’s version. Al-Wāqīdī’s version is also shorter than Ibn Ishāq’s version in other locations (1, 5, 12). These differences were possibly created by al-Wāqīdī 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-Wāqīdī may have drawn from Mūsā, whose version in al-Bayhaqi’s Dalā’il reports the same verb in ‘Ātika’s conveyance to al-‘Abbās: arsalat.\(^4^{24}\)

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-Wāqīdī, it was

\(^{24}\) Al-Bayhaqi, 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.\textsuperscript{425}

Whereas Jones maintained that al-Wāqīdī drew the rider’s exclamations from the qiṣṣa of his own time, the present analysis finds that al-Wāqīdī 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.\textsuperscript{426} It seems that al-Wāqīdī for his embellished version inserted the word thalātha in the third of the three locations, resulting in a total of nine exclamations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)\textsuperscript{427}</th>
<th>Al-Wāqīdī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She [ʿĀtīka] 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 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.”</td>
<td>She [ʿĀtīka] 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 same words three times. Then his camel mounted to the top of Abū Qubays. Then he shouted the same words three times.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{425} Jones, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqīdī,” 46.

\textsuperscript{426} Al-Bayhaqī, Dalā’īl al-nubuwwa, 3:103.

\textsuperscript{427} Ibid.
A variant that may show that al-Wāqidi either invented material or drew from other than Ibn Isḥāq pertains to the effect that ʿĀtika’s vision had upon her. In the text of Ibn Isḥāq in which the phrase is absent (3), there was only one effect of the vision upon ʿĀtika: it frightened her. In al-Wāqidi however, not only did ʿĀtika’s vision frighten her, but it also caused agony in her heart. This additional phrase in al-Wāqidi also finds no correlation in Mūsā’s version in al-Bayhaqi’s Dalā’il.

The Vision of ʿĀtika—Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-ʿAbbās said, “By God, this is indeed a vision. As for you, keep it to yourself and do not tell anyone about it.” Then al-ʿAbbās went out and met al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa, who was his friend. He told him about the vision and instructed him to keep it to himself. But al-Walīd told his father ʿUtba, and the story spread in Mecca until Quraysh were talking about it in their public meetings. Al-ʿAbbās said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Kaʿba, and there was Abū Jahl b. Hishām sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ʿĀtika’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 ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, since when have you had a prophetess among you?” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I said, “What do you mean by that?” He said, “That vision which ʿĀtika saw.” He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: Then I said, “What did she see?” He said, “O Banū ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy? ʿĀtika 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 Kaʿba among the Arabs.” He [Al-ʿAbbās] 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 ḥajj!’ Then you said, ‘We hold the office of the gatekeeper,’ and we said, ‘We don’t mind. You protect...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Wāqidi</td>
<td>They said: Her brother said, “This is indeed a vision!” He went out distressed and met al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa, 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. He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: I woke up early to circumambulate the Kaʿba, and there was Abū Jahl sitting with a group of Quraysh discussing ʿĀtika’s vision. Abū Jahl said, “What ʿĀtika saw was this!” I asked, “What is that?” He said, “O Banū ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, are you not satisfied that your men prophesy and now your women prophesy? ʿĀtika 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 Kaʿba among the Arabs.” He [Al-ʿAbbās] 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 ḥajj!’ Then you said, ‘We hold the office of the gatekeeper,’ and we said, ‘We don’t mind. You protect...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فَذَا الْحَدِيثِ، Al-Ṭabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.

قَالَ الْعَبَاسُ: وَلَا أَنْتُمْ لَنَا هَذِهِ لِرُوْيَا، Al-Ṭabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.

فَذَا الْحَدِيثِ، Al-Tabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.

قَالَ الْعَبَاسُ: وَلَا أَنْتُمْ لَنَا هَذِهِ لِرُوْيَا، Al-Ṭabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.

فَذَا الْحَدِيثِ، Al-Tabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.

فَذَا الْحَدِيثِ، Al-Tabarî, Ta'rikh, 3:1293.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
<th>حتى تحدثت به في البين في الدنيا.</th>
<th>Not present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>قال العباس</td>
<td>قال</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>فعندئذٍ</td>
<td>أطراف (الопредел) (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>بلبيت</td>
<td>بلبيت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>وأبو جهل بن هشام</td>
<td>لا يوجد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>في رده من فريق</td>
<td>في رده من فريق</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>يعودون</td>
<td>يعودون</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>في بروية عائكة</td>
<td>في بروية عائكة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>ردّجائم حتى تتبّنوا نصوامك</td>
<td>ردّجائم حتى تتبّنوا نصوامك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>في رواية إنه قال: إنّماؤه في ثلاثة</td>
<td>في رواية إنه قال: إنّماؤه في ثلاثة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>فشيرت بهم</td>
<td>فشيرت بهم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾ (via al-Tabarî—)</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
<td>﴿فَالَّذِي أَرَى أَبُو جَهَلَ الْمَلَكَ، أَمَّا رَضِيتَ يَتَبَّنَى رَجَالَكَ هَذِهِ نَصْوَامَكَ﴾</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The Vision of ʿĀtika—Section 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.”</td>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إيه كبير إلا أنني جدخت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون عائكة رأيت شيا. قال: ثم تزافينا. فلما أصبت، لم تبق أمه أمة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أختي، فقالت: أقررت لهذا الفاسق الخبيث بقع في راجاكل، ثم قد تناول النسا، وأنت تسمع، ثم لم يكن ذلك غير شيء مما سمعت، قال: فلما قل واشنعت، ما كان مني إيه كبير. وأين الله لاإعترضن له، فإن عاد لأكيفكك. 440 | قال: فوالله ما كان مني إيه كبير إلا أنني جدخت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون عائكة رآيت شيا. فلما أصبت لم تبق أمه أمة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أختي، فقالت: رضيت بهذا الفاسق الخبيث بقع في راجاكل، ثم قد تناول نسائكم وأنت تسمع، ولم يكن تلك غير شيء؟ قال: والله ما فعلت إلا ما لا باله والله لأعترضن له عدا، فإن عاد لأكيفكك. 440 |

36 قال العباس: فوالله ما كان مني إيه كبير إلا أنه لا أني جدخت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون عائكة رآيت شيا. 36a قال: ثم تزافينا. فلما أصبت لم تبق أمه أمة من بني عبد المطلب إلا أختي 37 ممني إيه كبير إلا أنه لا أني جدخت ذلك، وأنكرت أن تكون عائكة 38

---

438 Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣaḥīḥ, 1:609.
439 Al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 1:30.
440 لأكيفكك, Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1294.
For the passage in which al-'Abbās vowed to confront Abū Jahl, it is clear that al-Wāqidi drew from Ibn Istāq. Not only is al-Wāqidi’s report parallel to the one in Ibn Istāq, but there are also five locations in which the parallels are literal (36a, 39a, 40a, 41a, 44a). Moreover, it is possible that al-Wāqidi shortened the narrative of Ibn Istāq in several locations (36, 39, 41, 42, 43).

The extra material in al-Wāqidi (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 Istāq or invented by al-Wāqidi. The report, which exhibits characteristics such as repetition and an emphasis on number, was already identified by Jones as belonging to the qāṣṣ.441

The Vision of ‘Ātika—Section 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Istāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>Al-Wāqidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

442 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sira, 1:609.
was a thin man with sharp features, a sharp tongue and a sharp glance. He [Al-ʿAbbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-ʿAbbās] 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-ʿAbbās] said: However he had heard the voice of Damḍam b. ʿAmr, who was saying, “O people of Quraysh, O people of Luʿayy 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.” Damḍam 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.”

Q1: And the people of Quraysh, and the people of Luʿayy b. Ghālib, 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.

Q2: And the people of Quraysh, and the people of Luʿayy b. Ghālib, 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.

Ibn Iṣḥāq (via Ibn Ḥishām)

| 44a   | غدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤية عائكة، وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45    | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45a   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45b   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45c   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45d   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45e   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 46    | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه

Al-Wāqidi

| 44a   | غدوت في اليوم الثالث من رؤية عائكة، وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45    | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45a   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه، وأذكر ما أحفظه من الناس به من مقابلتهم لي ما قلت، قل الله إن لم أشني نحوه
| 45b   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45c   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45d   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 45e   | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه
| 46    | وأنا حديث معضب، أرى أن قد فاتني منه أمر أحب أن أدركه

The text is from Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1295.
The large number of literal parallels (44a, 45a, 45c, 46a, 47a, 51a, 53a, 53b) shows that al-Wāqidi drew from Ibn Ishāq. With regard to some of the differences, al-Wāqidi 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-Wāqidi 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-Bayhaqi’s Dalāʾ il has the people of Ghālib b. Fihr as Damḍam’s addressee.447 The extra report (55b) in al-Wāqidi seems to have been drawn from other than Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā (A parallel report in another source was unable to be found).

447 Al-Bayhaqi, Dalāʾ il al-nubuwwa, 3:104.
Al-Wāqidī drew from Ibn Isḥāq 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 Shīʿite theology.

For the single combat story, al-Wāqidī was dependent upon Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq for the story of ʿĀtika’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 Isḥāq. 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 ʿĀtika’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 Isḥāq, mostly in the form of omissions and shortenings. In essence, al-Wāqidī’s narrative reads much like a summary of Ibn Isḥāq’s narrative. At the same time however, al-Wāqidī’s version of ʿĀtika’s vision contains entire reports that are not found in Ibn Isḥāq and is thus the
lengthier of the two. Finally, al-Wāqīdī’s narrative exhibits pro-ʿAbbāsid bias and marks of the qāṣṣ.
CHAPTER 3

MŪSĀ B. ʿUQBA AND DIFFERENTIATION

The analysis of the material ascribed to Mūsā b. ʿUqba [the Mūsā-version, or Mūsā-v] involves a comparison with the material of Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq, the recension of Ibn Hishām is supplied, and the variants of the Ibn Isḥāq-material from the recension of al-Ṭabarî are footnoted.

The recension of Ibn Hishām is also supplied for the second part of the analysis, and the variants from al-Ṭabarî’s recension are footnoted in the event that they report variations of the storyline. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqi)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.” Abū Bakr responded, “O messenger of God, the people are acquainted with the distance of the land. ʿAdī b. Abī al-Zighbāʾ informed us that the caravan was</td>
<td>News came to him [Muhammad] about Quraysh’s advance to protect their caravan. He consulted the people and told them about Quraysh. Abū Bakr al-Šiddīq arose and spoke well. Then ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb arose and spoke well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

449 The analysis concerns only those reports which are contained in both the recensions of Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabarî.

in such and such valley.” Ibn Fulayh said in his riwāya: 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.”

Then we came to terms. Muḥammad however was cognizant of the advance according to Ibn Isḥāq.

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. 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.

---

451. فاستشار النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس
452. أبو بكر الصديق
453. فقال أحسن
454. الخطب، قال وأحسن
455. وأنا الفخر عن فرسين بمسيرهما لم يمنعوا

Ibid.

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 ʿUmar are recorded differently in Mūsā-v than in Ibn Ịṣḥāq. Whereas their responses are provided in detail in Mūsā-v, their abrupt mention in Ibn Ịṣḥāq 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 Ịṣḥāq 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.456

The Council of War—Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ịṣḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prophet said, “Advise me.” Then al-Miqdād b. ʿAmr, 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.”</td>
<td>Then al-Miqdād b. ʿAmr 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the Prophet said, “Advise me.” When Saʿd b. Muʿādh saw how much the Prophet sought the advice of his companions—after they gave advice he returned to the consultation—Saʿd 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 Saʿd b. Muʿādh 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

456 ʿUmar’s response was also possibly excised.
458 Ibn Hishām, Al-Ṣīra, 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 ghimid 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‘ādh 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.”
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The speeches by al-Miqdād and Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh are pledges of allegiance to the Prophet.\textsuperscript{473} 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 Išāq 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 Išāq’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‘īda (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]-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”).”\textsuperscript{472} 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.

\textsuperscript{467} Al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, 3:1302.
\textsuperscript{468} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{469} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{470} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{471} However the pledge is attached to Sa’d b. ‘Ubāda in the version of Ma‘ar. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Al-Muṣannaf, 5:348-52, no. 9727. Of Sa’d b. ‘Ubāda and Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh, 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.

The Council of War—Section 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then al-‘Awwād b. ‘Abd al-Asad al-Makhzūmī advanced swearing by his god to surely drink from the cistern that Muhammad had built and to demolish it. He charged, and when he approached the</td>
<td>Al-‘Awwād 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 the cistern, or destroy it, or die without</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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477 In contrast, the council story in Mūsā-v does not function as asbāb al-nuzūl for Q. 8:7.
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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.

doing so. 142 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.

Compared with the simple and straightforward narrative of Mūsā-v, the narrative of Ibn Isḥāq is complex and animated, comprising of vivid details and various embellishments. In Ibn Isḥāq, 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 Isḥāq’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.

480 ـ لا لائم مه. Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1316.
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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-Walid 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. Hamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib arose as well as ‘Alī b. ʿAbd Allāh and ‘Ubayda b. al-Hārith b. al-Muṭṭalib. Hamza 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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-Walid 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. Hamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib arose as well as ‘Alī b. ʿAbd Allāh and ‘Ubayda b. al-Hārith b. al-Muṭṭalib. Hamza 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.</td>
<td>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 ‘Afra‘—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 their representative shouted, “O Muḥammad! Send forth against us peers from our tribal!” 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.” ‘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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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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.497

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:

---
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497 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 Muhammad in a more glorified manner. 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. 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. Moreover much of the vivid details may be due to retelling over a period of time.

The Vision of ʿĀtika—Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqi)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ʿĀtika d. Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the aunt of the Prophet, lived in Mecca with her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. Before Badr and before the arrival of ʿAmūdān, she saw a vision which frightened her. She sent for her brother al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib at night, and when al-ʿAbbās 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-ʿAbbās promised her, she said, “I

---

498 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, “Sirah Literature,” 356.

499 Duels themselves were common motifs in Ayyām al-ʿArab 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 Adabiyatsi 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.

500 EI 3, s.v. “Ayyām al-ʿArab.”


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 (bāyṭ) 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.”]
The two versions are distinguishable in their manner of style. The flow of the narrative in Māsāʾī is more irregular and discontinuous than that of Ibn Isḥaḏ. The more polished style of Ibn Isḥaḏ seems to be due to editorial activity which took place within his combined report. In the scene in which the rider shouted a series of warnings to the people of Mecca, Māsāʾī has the warning as brief, uninformative and inexact: “Leave in two or three nights.” The warning in Ibn Isḥaḏ’s version, however, is more lengthy, informative and specific: “Hasten to your disaster that will come in three days.” Later when Abū ʿAlī confronted Abū Ḥaṭṭāb about Aḥā’s vision, Abū ʿAlī repeated the inexact “two or three nights” in Māsāʾī whereas in Ibn Isḥaḏ he repeated three days.

The more enhanced nature of Ibn Isḥaḏ’s account is also indicated in view of the third warnings, the “people of treachery,” and the “people of immorality.” This uneven manner in which the rider uttered the addresses is absent from the version of Ibn Isḥaḏ.
Isḥāq which for all three proclamations has the addressee as consistently and only the “people of treachery.”

The Vision of Ātika—Section 2

Al-ʿAbbās was frightened from her vision. Then he departed from her and met al-Walīd b. ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa from the other night—al-Walīd was a friend of al-ʿAbbās. He related to him the vision of Ātika and ordered him not to tell anyone. But al-Walīd related it to his father ʿUtba, and ʿUtba related it to his brother Shayba. The story spread until it reached Abū Jahl b. Hishām, and it circulated among the people of Mecca.

The next morning, al-ʿAbbās circumambulated the Kaʿba (bayt) and found in the mosque Abū Jahl, ʿUtba and Shayba, sons of Rabīʿa, Umayya, Ubayy b. Khalaf, Zamʿa b. al-Aswad and Abū al-Bakhtārī in a group of Quraysh talking. When they saw al-ʿAbbās, 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.

When Abū Jahl asked, “What vision did Ātika see?” he [al-ʿAbbās] 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 Kaʿba, a more untruthful woman or man among you. And his offense was the greater insult.”

Abū Jahl said, “Ātika claimed that”

---

513 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalāʾ il-nabwiyā, 3:103-4.
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 Quṣayy, 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-Fadl, I was neither ignorant nor stupid." Al-'Abbās suffered severe insult from Āṭīka 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."
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A difference between the two accounts has to do with the depiction of al-ʿAbbās. In Mūsā-ʾv, al-ʿAbbās was caught lying by Abū Jahl who then reduced him with a couple insults. The first insult shamed al-ʿAbbās for lying that ʿĀtika had not related her vision to him, and the following insult is an escalation of the first one, threatening to charge al-ʿAbbās 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-ʿAbbās’s experience of severe insult.

In contrast, the corresponding narrative in Ibn Isḥāq’s version displays al-ʿAbbās in a favorable light. Abu Jahl’s inflammatory accusations against him are both minimized and contradicted. Moreover, when the women of Banū al-Muṭṭalib accused al-ʿAbbās of allowing Abū Jahl to insult his tribe, al-ʿAbbās offered another contradiction, this time to the women’s accusation.

Thus whereas Mūsā-ʾv is not characterized by pro-ʿAbbāsid bias, Ibn Isḥāq’s material shows partiality towards al-ʿAbbās.

The Vision of ʿĀtika—Section 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When it was the evening of the third night after the night that ʿĀtika saw the vision, the rider who was sent by Abū</td>
<td>On the third day after ʿĀtika’s vision, I went out seething with anger, thinking that I had let go of a matter for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sufyān, Damḍam b. Amr al-Ghīfārī, came and shouted, “O people of Ghalīb b. Fīh, 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 Āṭika.

Al-ʿAbbās said, “Such is this you claimed, accusing Āṭika of lying.” And they hastened on every refractory and tractable camel.

Abū Jahl said, “Does Muḥammad think it will be like what happened at Nakha. 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-ʿAbbās] said: Suddenly he went out towards the door of the mosque hurriedly. He [Al-ʿAbbās] 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-ʿAbbās] said: However he had heard something that I had not heard, the voice of Damḍam b. Amr al-Ghīfārī 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.

Ibn Iṣḥāq supplies a series of reports that esteem Al-ʿAbbās. Al-ʿAbbās 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-ʿAbbās is not present in the corresponding account in Mūsā-v.

527 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, 3:1295.
528 Ibid.
529 Ibid.
In addition, storyteller elements are included in Ibn Isḥāq’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 Đamḍam “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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq in the form of omissions and an addition. Moreover, whereas both versions include Qur’ānic material, Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq’s version is characterized by qāṣṣ material whereas Mūsā-v is a more straightforward narration of events. In addition, Ibn Isḥāq’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 ʿĀtika’s vision. The positive portrayal by Ibn Isḥāq seems not to have arisen with al-ʿAbbās himself but was probably created during the second Islamic century. The patronage of the ʿAbbāsid court to Ibn Isḥāq would have ensured the positive portrayal, and the method of the combined report indicated by his more polished style offered Ibn Isḥāq the liberty of incorporating and editing reports in favor of al-ʿAbbās. In contrast, the version attributed to Mūsā does not seem to have been affected politically.
As a whole, Ibn Isḥāq’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 Isḥāq’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:\(^{530}\)

1. The departure of the caravan led by Abū Sufyān from Syria to Mecca
2. Muḥammad’s dispatch of the scouts ʿAdī 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 ʿĀtika
5. Juḥaym’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. ʿUṭba’s advice to not fight Muḥammad
12. ʿUmayr b. Wahb’s estimation of the number of the Muslims
13. Muḥammad’s sleep before the battle
14. The martyrdom of ʿUmayr b. Ḥammâm
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 Masʿūd’s slaying of Abū Jahl
22. Al-Ḥayṣumān’s report in Mecca of their defeat and the report’s challenge by Ṣafwān
23. The death of ʿUqba 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.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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-Bakhtārī, 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 Ḥāshim. You will see tomorrow who will be killed.”</td>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---
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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.\footnote{533}

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quraysh returned to Mecca</td>
<td>The first of the arrivals to Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defeated and put to flight.</td>
<td>from Quraysh was al-Ḥazwām b. 'Abd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first who arrived with</td>
<td>Allāh al-Khuza‘ī. When they asked, “What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news of the polytheists’</td>
<td>happened?” he replied, “Slain are ’Utba b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defeat was al-Ḥaysumān al-Ka‘bī,</td>
<td>Rabī‘a, Shayba b. Rabī‘a, Abū al-Ḥakam b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the grandfather of Ḥasan b.</td>
<td>Hishām, Umayya b. Khalaf, Zam‘a b. al-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghīlān. The people gathered</td>
<td>Aswad, Nubayh and Munabbiḥ, the sons of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the Ka‘ba, questioning him,</td>
<td>al-Ḥajjāj, and Abū al-Bakhtarī b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and there was not a man among</td>
<td>Hishām. When he began to enumerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chiefs of Quraysh about</td>
<td>the chiefs of Quraysh, Saḥwān b. Umayya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whom they asked whose death</td>
<td>who was sitting in the ḥijr said, “By God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he did not announce.</td>
<td>if this man is in his right mind, ask him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saḥwān b. Umayya, seated with</td>
<td>about me.” So they asked, “What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group of Quraysh in the</td>
<td>happened to Saḥwān b. Umayya?” He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥijr, said, “By God, this man</td>
<td>answered, “There he is sitting in the ḥijr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has lost his senses. His mind</td>
<td>and by God I saw his father and his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is confused, for he has forgotten</td>
<td>brother when they were killed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Saḥwān b. Umayya?” He answered, “Yes, he is there sitting in the ḥijr. I saw the killing of his father Umayya b. Khalaf.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And it is the case that Fāsilūn b. ʿAmīr said: “O Allah, the Exalted!” He answered: “What is the matter?” He said: “‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥādī said to me: ‘When you take the bocent and you have the palm, you will have an angel.”’

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

\footnote{533} 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. Jušam al-Madlijī. Al-Bayhaqī, Dalāʾīl al-nubuwwa, 3:111.

\footnote{534} Ibid., 116.
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elongated criticism of al-Ḥaysumān by Ṣafwān. Notwithstanding one component present exclusively in Ibn Isḥāq: 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 Isḥāq.

Elsewhere, the converse is observable. For the report in which some Meccans changed their mind about reaching Badr, Ibn Isḥāq’s account gives the appearance of being an expanded version of the account in Mūsā-v:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ῶqba (via al-Bayhaqi)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 Juhfa 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.” 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. 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.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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!” Al-Akhnas b. Sharīq b. 'Amr b. Wahb al-Thaqafi, an ally of Banū Zuhra who was in al-Juhfa, 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 'Adiy 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...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

536 Al-Bayhaqi, Dalā’il al-nubuwya, 3:108.
537 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:618-19.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī) 539</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām) 540</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He did not kill the bound prisoners except for ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt. Āshīm b. Thābit b. Abī al-Qālah, brother of Banū Āmr b. ‘Awf, killed him. When ‘Uqba</td>
<td>He [Muḥammad] went on, and in I’rāq al-Zabya, he killed ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt. He who had captured ‘Uqba was Abī Al-lāh b. Salīma, one of Banū al-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

538 Al-Ṭabarī, Tūrīkh, 3:1307.
539 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalā‘ī l-nubuwaww, 3:117.
540 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:644.
Whereas Mūsā-v focuses on ʿUqba’s crime of possessing enmity against God and His messenger, Ibn Ishāq’s version has to do with ʿUqba’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:

**Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqi)**

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?”

Mūsā b. ‘Uqba—Nāfiʾ—ʿAbd 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.”

---

**Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)**

Yazid b. Rūmān—ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr—ʿĀ‘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 [ʿĀ‘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.”

ʿĀ‘isha said: The people say [that he

---

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-Bakhtārī, Mūsā-v makes clear its inconclusiveness concerning the responsible person for Abū al-Bakhtārī’s killing. Ibn Iṣḥāq however asserts al-Mujadhīdh as his slayer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muslims before the battle that if they ran into ‘Abbās, ‘Uqayl, Nawfal b. al-Harīth, or al-Bakhtārī, they were not to be killed. By the Prophet’s order, these and other individuals were captured, with the exception of Abū al-Bakhtārī, 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</th>
<th>Ibn Iṣḥāq (via Ibn Hīshām) 454</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ma‘bad—one of his family—Ibn ʿAbbās: The Prophet said to his companions that day, “I know that some men of Banū Ḥāshim and others have come out unwillingly and saw no need to fight us; so whoever meets anyone from Banū Ḥāshim, do not kill him; and whoever meets Abū al-Bakhtārī b. al-Hārīth b. Asad, do not kill him; neither kill al-ʿAbbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the Prophet’s uncle, for he has been forced to come out.” Abū Ḥudhayfā replied, “Are we to kill our fathers, our sons, our brothers, and our families and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that Abū al-Yasar killed Abū al-Bakhtārī—but this is also denied by important others, except to say that it was al-Mujaddār who killed him, or Abū Dāwud al-‘Aţānī killed him and stripped him of his sword and kept it until it was sold to some members of the tribe of Abū al-Bakhtārī. Al-Mujaddār said,

Tell the orphan when you met al-Bakhtārī.

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-Mujaddār implored Abū al-Bakhtārī not to surrender, informing him that the Prophet forbade his killing if he surrendered. Abū al-Bakhtārī however refused to surrender and incited al-Mujaddār 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 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-Yamāmā.

The Prophet forbade the killing of Abū al-Bakhtārī 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 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-Bakhtārī, “The Prophet has forbidden us to kill you—with Abū al-Bakhtārī was his companion who had left with him from Mecca, Junāda b. Mulayḥa d. Zuhayr b. al-Hārith b. Asad; Junāda was a man of Banū Layth, and the name of Abū al-Bakhtārī was al-‘Āṣ—He [Abū al-Bakhtārī] 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.”
إنه، عن ابن عباس: أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لأصحابه بومدة: إنك عرفت أن رجلاً من بني هاشم وعمره قد أخرجوا كرهاً لا حاجة لهم بيقذفك، فمن لقي منهم أعنا من بني هاشم فلا يقتله ومن لقي أحداً من بني بردى فإنني لقيه، فإن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: فهل أتى أحدكم بمقصود له؟ قال أبو حضيفة: على أئتمهم أبو ذر وأبا نبيتة وأبا لاواتة وعشرتنا، وتركنا الملك، والله لن رست الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعمبر بن الحطبي: يا أبا حمص - قال عمر: والله إنه لأول يوم كانوا فيه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وأبا حمص - أضرب وجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالسبيل؟ قال عمر: يا عبد الله، سرني. ففاضح عن السبيل، فعذبه الله ناقف، فكان أبو حذيفة يقول ما أنا من أبناء تلك الوسيلة التي قلته يوم، فمات منها خالفاً، إن تكونها عن الشهادة، فقتل يوم اليمامة شهيداً، وما إن ينهي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن قتل أبي البختر، لأنه كتبه القوم على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو يملك، وكان لا يؤذاه ولا يبلغ عنه شيء، بيده، وكان من طلبه في نفسه الصالحية التي كتب قريش على بني هاشم وبني المطلب، فلقبه المجرد بن داية البلوي، حليف الأنصار، ثم من بني سبأ، عرف، قال المجرد لأبي البختر: إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد نهاناه عن تلك، ومع أبي البختر، زميل له، قد خرج معه من مكة وهو جندة بن مليحة بن زهير بن الحارث بن أسد، وجندة رجل من بني ثياب، واسم أبي البختر: العاص - قال: ورمي، قال له المجرد: لا والله، ما أتينه تلك ومكره زميل، ما أتينه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا بك تحدث عن سبأ مكة، إن تركت زميله حرصاً على الحيا، قالت الأنصار، بناء المجرد بن داية... ثم المصجرن أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فكان يد عكك بالحق، قد جئت عليه أن يستنفر فتكبه، إلا أن يقاتل، فقالت: قال: ثم أسلمت.
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-Šiddiq 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.”
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 Isḥāq.\textsuperscript{549}

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.\textsuperscript{550}

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Mūsā b. Ῥqba (via al-Bayhaqī) & Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām) \\
\hline
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’lab b. Ṣu’ayr al-‘Udhrī, 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.

\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{549} For Ibn Isḥāq’s inclusion of asbāb al-nuzūl, see page 141 of the present study.

\textsuperscript{550} 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-mubawwā, 3:111.

\textsuperscript{551} Ibid., 115.

\textsuperscript{552} Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:628.
Another divergence in the storyline’s presentation involves the story of Ibn Mas’ūd’s slaying of Abū Jahl:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqi)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishaq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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 umma.” 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.</strong></td>
<td><strong>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. Ju’dān 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</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

553 Al-Bayhaqi, Dalā’il al-nubuwwa, 3:116.
554 Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:635-36.
seen Abū Jahl as though unwounded but now observed on his neck pustules and on his hands, the mark of lashes.

Ibn Masʿūd came to the Prophet and informed him that Abū Jahl had been slain. Ibn Masʿūd 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 Masʿūd used to say: He [Abū Jahl] said to me, “You have ascended a difficult ascent, O little shepherd.” He [Ibn Masʿūd] 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 Masʿūd] said: This was the oath of the Prophet—He [Ibn Masʿūd] 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.
version had undergone development, for according to a different report, Abū Jahl’s slayer was not Ibn Masʿūd but both sons of Ṭhrā‘:555

Musaddad—Yūsuf b. al-Mājishūn—Ṣāliḥ b. Ibrāhīm—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf—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 Muʿādh b. ʿAmr b. Jamūḥ.” The two were Muʿādh b. Ṭhrā‘ and Muʿādh b. ʿAmr b. al-Jamūḥ.

It may be that Ibn Isḥāq’s desire to include these two sons (in addition to Ibn Masʿūd) 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, Muʿādh, Muʿawwidh and Ibn Masʿūd are joined by a fourth entity, angels:

The Prophet stood where the two sons of Ṭhrā‘ had died and said, “God bless the two sons of Ṭhrā‘, 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 Masʿūd killed him. Each one shared in his killing.”556

Other kinds of variations between the version of Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq has it as “thirty or forty men.”557 In the same passage, Mūsā-v has Ḥuwwayṭib remaining in Mecca and not participating at Badr. In Ibn Isḥāq however, the only Meccan who stayed behind was the chief Abū Lahab:

---

555 Al-Bukhārī, Al-ǧāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ, 2:286.
556 Al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-maḡāžī, 1:91.
557 Al-Bayḥaqī, Dalā’il al-nubuwwa, 3:102; Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:606. It seems more feasible that Muhammad 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.
The Prophet stayed for two months after the killing of Ibn al-Hadrāmī. 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-ʿĀṣ, 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 Ḥuwwayṭīb b. 'Abd al-ʿUzza 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-Hadrāmī and the capture of two men, Uthmān and al-Ḥakim, had taken place.

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-ʿĀṣ b. Wā'il b. Hishām. . . . The people prepared quickly, saying, “Do Muḥammad and his companions think that it will be like the caravan of Ibn al-Ḥadrāmī? 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 Laḥab b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who remained and sent in his place al-ʿĀṣ b. Hishām b. al-Mughīra who owed him four thousand dirhams which he was unable to pay. So he [Abū Laḥab] hired him in the place of repayment and sent him off. Thus he [al-ʿĀṣ] went in his place and Abū Laḥab stayed behind.

A variation in which the plot is affected is found in the report in which Muḥammad sent ʿAdī 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

---

558 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalāʾil al-nubuwwa, 3:102.
559 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
<th>The Prophet set out in the month of Ramadan with his companions. ... When he was near al-Ṣafra’ he sent Basbas b. [‘Amr] al-Juhani, an ally of Banū Sāída, and ‘Adī b. Abī Zaghbā’ al-Juhani, ally of Banū al-Najjār, to Badr to seek out news about Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb and his caravan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</td>
<td>When news of Abū Sufyān’s caravan was told to the Prophet, he dispatched ‘Adī b. Abī al-Zaghbā’, an ʿAnsārī of Banū Ghanīm of the lineage of Juwayna, and Basbas, i.e. Ibn ‘Amr, to search for it. The two set out until they reached the tribe of Juwayna 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.”

Another plot divergence involves the event that prompted Abū Sufyān to send Ḍaḥmām to Mecca for help. In Mūsā-v, Abū Sufyān dispatched Ḍaḥmām upon learning of the spies ‘Adī and Basbas.  

---

560 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalā’il al-nubuwwa, 3:102.
562 Ibid., 606-7.
563 Ibn Ishāq’s version is provided to show that Abū Sufyān did not dispatch Ḍaḥmām upon discovering the spies. Concerning the coproscopy, Wansbrough suspects that it was intentionally inserted for the purpose of adding color. Wansbrough, Sectarian Milieu, 39.
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 Dāmḍām b. 'Amr, to Quraysh, saying, "Hurry and defend your caravan from Muḥammad and his companions. He has called his men out to attack us."

In Ibn Ishaq however, Abū Sufyān had not yet learned of the spies. He instead dispatched Dāmḍām 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 Hijāz, 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 Dāmḍām b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī and sent him to Mecca, ordering him to go to Quraysh and seek

---

564 Al-Bayhaqī, Dalā’il al-nubuwwa, 3:103.
565 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.\footnote{Ibn Hishām, \textit{Al-Sīra}, 1:606-7.}

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,\footnote{ʿĀtika’s vision in which “two or three nights” is mentioned is supportive of this estimation. Al-Bayhaqī, \textit{Dalāʾil al-nubuwwa}, 3:103-5.} and the journey of Quraysh to Badr required approximately three days,\footnote{Ibid., 109-10.} 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
Muslims as an incompetent people, exceedingly slow at both organizing themselves and moving to a neighboring town.\textsuperscript{569}

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 [Muhammad] that Quraysh had set out to protect their caravan.”\textsuperscript{570} Secondly, Muhammad had questioned an old Bedouin who in response precisely pointed out Quraysh’s location.\textsuperscript{571} A comparison of the versions reveals the difference in plot:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ʿUqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prophet proceeded until evening, drawing a little closer to Badr. He dispatched ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām and Basbas al-Anṣārī of Banū Sāʿida 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-Hajjāj and the other belonged to the people of al-ʿĀṣ. It is said of the latter that he converted to Islam.</td>
<td>Then the Prophet returned to his companions. When evening came, he sent ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām and Saʿd 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 ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr told me. They came upon water-carriers of Quraysh, among whom were Aslam, a slave of Banū al-Hajjāj, and ʿArid Abū Yāsār, a slave of Banū al-ʿĀṣ b. Saʿīd, 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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{569} This problematic account in Mūsā-v is also found in ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr’s alleged letter to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik. Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 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.

\textsuperscript{570} Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:614-15.

\textsuperscript{571} Ibid., 615-16.

\textsuperscript{572} Al-Bayhaqī, Dalāʿī l-al-nubwya, 3:108.

\textsuperscript{573} Ibn Hishām, Al-Sīra, 1:616.
Further examination of the work of Ibn Isḥaq reveals that his version had undergone alteration. According to Ibn Isḥaq, 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:

---

574 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.’"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urwa b. al-Zubayr (via al-Ṭabarî)</th>
<th>Ibn Ishaq (via Ibn Hishâm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prophet marched forward and alighted near Badr. He sent al-Zubayr al-ʿAwwâm 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 Banû al-Ḥajjâj. 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 Abû Sufyân 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 Abû Sufyân 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 Abû Sufyân and his companions.” When they beat him severely and asked him about Abû Sufyân and his companions, although he had no knowledge about them and was of the water-carriers of Quraysh, he said, “Yes, this is Abû Sufyân.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the Prophet returned to his companions. When evening came, he sent ʿAlî b. Abî Ṭâlib and al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwâm and Saʿd b. Abî Waqqâs with a few of his companions to the water of Badr to seek out news, according to what Yazîd b. Rûmân from Urwa b. al-Zubayr told me. They came upon water-carriers of Quraysh, among whom were Aslâm, a slave of Banû al-Ḥajjâj, and ‘Arîd Abû Yasîr, a slave of Banû al-ʾĀṣ b. Saʿîd, 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 Abû Sufyân, so they beat them. When they had caused them distress, the slaves said, “We belong to Abû Sufyân.” Then they let them go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

575 Al-Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, 3:1286-87.
576 Ibn Hishâm, Al-Sîra, 1:616.
Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq, 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 Isḥāq’s version:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Rabi’ā 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-Ḥadrāmī 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-Ḥadrāmī]”… Quraysh assembled for battle, and</td>
<td>My father, Isḥāq 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-Jumāhī, 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 Isḥāq] 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

578 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 Muhammad 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 hun dred 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 you of the same number as their own, what is the benefit of living after that? Decide as you see fit.” When Ḥākīm 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 Muhammad 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 Muhammad. 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 Muhammad and his companions. No by God, we will not go back until God decides between us and Muhammad. What ‘Utba has said is meaningless to himself, but he had seen that Muhammad 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.”
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 Isḥāq however, he was Mihja'. It appears that Ibn Isḥāq would have 'Umayr as the third Muslim martyr:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. 'Uqba (via al-Bayhaqī)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Hammām, the brother of Banū Salima, arose, bearing on the ground with clanged 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.</td>
<td>Mihja’, the mawlā of 'Umar b. al-Khattāb, was hit by an arrow and was killed. He was the first among the Muslims to be killed. Then while Ḥarīthā b. Surāq, one of Banū ‘Adiy 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 Muhammad, 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-Hammām, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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." 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq however, al-Ḥubāb offered the advice at Badr after trekking through the rain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūsā b. Uqba (via al-Bayhaqi)</th>
<th>Ibn Isḥāq (via Ibn Hishām)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prophet arose and said, “Adviseme concerning the location.” Al-Ḥubāb b. al-Mundhir, a man of the Ansār 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</td>
<td>God sent a rain—the wādi-bed wassoft—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-Jamūh said, “O messenger of God, do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 vessels.

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-Hubāb] 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.

وبعث الله السماء، وكان الوادي دهسا، فاصاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقال: أشروا عليّ في المنزل قاق الحجاب بن المشرك رجل من الأنصار ثم أحرز النبي سلمة، فقال: أنا يا رسول الله عالم بها وعليها إن رأيت أن تسير إلى قليل منها قد عرقتها كثير الماء عدة تلتزلي عليها وناسب القوم إليها وتغوز ما سواها فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: سروا فإن الله تعالى قد وعده أن يكون لهان الذين أتىهم كله. فوقع في قلوب الناس كثير الخوف، وكان فيهم شيء من تخاذل من تخويف الشيطان.

فسأل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والمسلمون سبابين إلى الماء وسار المشركون سرايا يردون الماء فأنزل الله عليهم في تلك الليلة مطرها وأخذ فكان على المشركين بلاء شديد متعهم أن يسروا وكأنهم على المسلمين ديمة خفيفة ليهجم السير بالمشركين والمشركين ونماض دهجة سقي من القلوب في ماء فاصابه حتى كثر ماها وصغوا في توقمهم ثم غزوا ما سواه من الماء، وقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: عدد الناس من الشياطين أنها لم تقل لهم أئذى ماء من القدم، فنزل، وكان المسلمون من معه يمتملهم في الغرب، ثم تبني عليه حوضا، فنمله ماء ثم نقل القرآن، فقال: يا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال: أشرب ولا يشرب، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: إن الله لا يشربه، فأمر بالقنب، فأمر بالماء، وأمر بالماء من المشاهد، فسار حتى تأتي أئذى ماء من القدم، فنزل عليه، ثم أمر بالقنب غزورت، وبنى حوضا على القنب الذي نزل عليه، فصب ماء، ثم قذفوه فيه الماء.
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. 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 ʿAbbās 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.

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.”

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

---
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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 ʿAbbās. 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 ʿAbbās is found in the *Tafsīr* of Ibn Kathīr:589

ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalḥa from Ibn ʿAbbās 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.

Conclusion

For the story of the Battle of Badr, the version of Ibn Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq’s version in one instance displays more certainty than Mūsā’s, 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq underwent alteration but also that invention played a role in the development of the Badr narrative.
CONCLUSION

The Ibn Isḥāq-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 Isḥāq’s material was used by al-Wāqidī for his version of Badr, al-Wāqidī did not cite Ibn Isḥāq as an authority. Both Ibn Isḥāq’s and al-Wāqidī’s versions of Badr were affected by pro-ʿAbbāsid 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq and therefore avoid dealing with his reconstructed storyline. 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

---

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.  

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-nabīyyu ṣallā llāhu ʿalayhi wajsallam ḥattā ʿarrasa qarīban min badr.  

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:  

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.  

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

593 Al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 3:1286.
594 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.
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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 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.

595 The simultaneous arrival of the Muslims and Meccans at Badr.
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