

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS
VOLUME LXXV

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS
VOLUME LXXV

STUDIES IN
ARABIC LITERARY PAPYRI
I
HISTORICAL TEXTS

BY NABIA ABBOTT



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS • CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 56-5027

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO 37

Cambridge University Press, London, N.W. 1, England

The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5, Canada

Copyright under the International Copyright Union, 1957

All rights reserved. Published 1957

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY CHARLES BATEY, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

TO
MARTIN SPRENGLING

PREFACE

ARABIC papyri hitherto published have been mostly administrative and economic documents. This fact reflects the comparatively ready availability of such materials and the Arabists' lively interest in early Islāmic imperial administration and economy—fields in which the papyri have made basic contributions to our knowledge.

Arabic literary papyri are quite rare and for the most part fragmentary. They demand much labor and ingenuity for their dating and identification. Working with such materials has its drawbacks, not the least of which is the task of sifting an enormous body of pre-Islāmic and early Islāmic literature which generally survives only in later recensions and extracts. It is, therefore, not surprising that comparatively little effort has been made so far to study even the few Arabic literary pieces long known to exist in the large collections of papyri in Cairo, Vienna, and Heidelberg and in the smaller collections in London, Manchester, Paris, and Milan. Yet, it is such papyri that can add volumes—both literally and figuratively—to our knowledge of the cultural and intellectual life of the first two centuries of Islām.

The Oriental Institute collection of Arabic papyri has been growing since the first acquisition, in 1929, by Director James Henry Breasted and Professor Martin Sprengling. The last sizable addition to the collection was made in 1947 by Director Thorkild Jacobsen on the recommendation of the present writer. It consisted of 331 papyri and six early paper documents. Classification of these documents brought to light thirty literary pieces—an unusually high percentage—and presented a challenge that could not be ignored. The first response of the writer was the publication, in 1949, of "A ninth-century fragment of the *'Thousand Nights,'*" a literary find in a class by itself.

Subsequently came the opportunity to examine and classify the collection of Arabic papyri at the University of Michigan. This yielded twelve more literary documents that formed a valuable supplement to those of the Oriental Institute. Finally, a request to the authorities of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna brought welcome photostats of six Arabic literary papyri listed in *PERF*.

Selections from the three groups of Arabic literary papyri mentioned above form the basis of a series of studies beginning with the present volume of historical documents. A second volume, now in preparation, will cover Qur'ānic commentary, law, and Tradition. Documents representing invocation, language and literature, and sundry scientific themes will be presented in subsequent volumes and/or articles as time and opportunity permit.

My thanks are due to Dr. Josef Stummvoll, Director of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, for permission to publish Documents 1 and 4 of the present study. I am grateful to Director Carl H. Kraeling and the Oriental Institute's Publication Committee, Keith C. Seele, Chairman, for helpful co-operation and to Mrs. Elizabeth B. Hauser, Editorial Secretary of the Oriental Institute, for expert editing of the manuscript.

NABIA ABBOTT

The Oriental Institute
Chicago, 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF PLATES	xi
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	xiii
INTRODUCTION	I
Literary Scripts and Scribal Practices	I
Historical Contribution	5
Early Islāmic Historiography	5
DOCUMENT 1. GOD AND THE CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE	32
DOCUMENT 2. STORY OF ADAM AND EVE	38
DOCUMENT 3. EPISODES IN JEWISH HISTORY	57
DOCUMENT 4. THE <i>SIRAH</i> OF IBN HISHĀM: THE SECOND MEETING OF ‘AQABAH	61
DOCUMENT 5. CAMPAIGNS OF MUḤAMMAD	65
DOCUMENT 6. THE <i>TA’RIKH AL-KHULAFĀ’</i> OF IBN ISHĀQ: THE ASSASSINATION OF ‘UMAR I AND THE APPOINTMENT OF THE ELECTIVE COUNCIL	80
DOCUMENT 7. THE <i>DHIKR AL-NABI</i> OF IBN ‘UQDAH: ZAIDITE HISTORY OF THE PROPHET AND HIS FAMILY	100
DOCUMENT 8. ACCOUNT OF A BATTLE IN THE REIGN OF MUQTADIR	109
INDEX	117

LIST OF PLATES

1. DOCUMENT 1
- 2-3. DOCUMENT 2
4. DOCUMENT 3
5. DOCUMENT 4
- 6-7. DOCUMENT 5
- 8-9. DOCUMENT 6
- 10-11. DOCUMENT 7
- 12-13. DOCUMENT 8

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- Abū Nu'aim Abū Nu'aim al-Iṣfahānī. *Ḥilyat al-awliyā' wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā'* (10 vols.; Cairo, 1932-38).
- Aghānī* Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī. *Kitāb al-aghānī*, ed. Naṣr al-Hūrīnī (20 vols.; Būlāq, 1868); Indexes, ed. Ignazio Guidi (Leyde, 1900).
- AJS* American journal of Semitic languages and literatures (Chicago etc., 1884-1941).
- Akhbār* or *Akhbār 'Ubaid* 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah. *Akhbār* (published in *Tījān*, pp. 311-492).
- 'Āmilī Muḥsin al-Amīn al-Ḥusainī al-'Āmilī. *A'yān al-Shī'ah* (35 vols.; Damascus, 1935-50).
- Ansāb* Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī. *Kitāb ansāb al-ashrāf* V, ed. S. D. F. Goiten (Jerusalem, 1936).
- Bell Richard Bell. The Qur'ān, translated, with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs (2 vols. consecutively paged; Edinburgh, 1937-39).
- BGA* Bibliotheca geographorum Arabicorum, ed. Michael Jan de Goeje (8 vols.; Lugduni Batavorum, 1897-1939).
- Bukhārī Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-Bukhārī. *Al-jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Ludolf Krehl (4 vols.; Leyde, 1862-1908).
- Caetani Leone Caetani. *Annali dell' Islam* (10 vols.; Milano, 1905-26).
- Dhahabī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Dhahabī. *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ* (4 vols.; Ḥaidarābād, 1333-34 A.H.).
- Eclīpse* H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth. The eclipse of the 'Abbasid caliphate. Original chronicles of the fourth Islamic century, ed., tr., and elucidated . . . (7 vols.; Oxford etc., 1920-21).
- EI* The encyclopaedia of Islam (Leyden, 1913—).
- Fihrist* Muḥammad ibn Ishāq al-Nadīm. *Kitāb al-fihrist*, ed. Gustav Flügel (Leipzig, 1871-72).
- GAL* Carl Brockelmann. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (2 vols.; Weimar etc., 1898-1902).
- GAL S* —. Supplement (3 vols.; Leipzig, 1937-42).
- Goldziher, *Studien* Ignaz Goldziher. *Muhammedanische Studien* (2 vols.; Halle a. S., 1888-90).
- Ḥājjī Khalifah Muṣṭafā ibn 'Abd Allāh Ḥājjī Khalīfah. *Kashf al-zunūn* (Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum), ed. Gustav Flügel (Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland. Publications, No. 42 [7 vols.; London, 1835-58]).
- Ibn al-Athīr 'Izz al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Athīr. *Al-kāmil fī al-ta'rīkh* (Chronicum), ed. C. J. Thornberg (14 vols.; Lugduni Batavorum, 1851-76).
- Ibn 'Asākir 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Asākir. *Al-ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, ed. Aḥmad 'Ubaid (7 vols.; Damascus, 1911-32).
- Ibn Ḥanbal Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal. *Al-musnad* (6 vols.; Cairo, 1895).
- Ibn Sa'd Muḥammad ibn Sa'd. *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* (Biographien Muhammeds), ed. Eduard Sachau (9 vols.; Leiden, 1904-40).
- Ibn Taghrībirdī Abū al-Maḥāsin Yūsuf ibn Taghrībirdī. *Al-nujūm al-zāhirah* (Annals), ed. T. W. J. Juynboll and B. F. Matthes (2 vols.; Lugduni Batavorum, 1852-61).
- '*Iqd* Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi. *Al-'iqd al-farīd* (3 vols.; Cairo, 1293 A.H.).
- Irshād* Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh. *Kitāb irshād al-arīb ilā ma'rīfat al-adīb* (Dictionary of learned men), ed. D. S. Margoliouth ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" series VI [7 vols.; Leyden, 1907-27]).
- Iṣābah* Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī. *Kitāb al-iṣābah fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥābah* (Biographical dictionary), ed. Aloys Sprenger (Bibliotheca Indica XX [4 vols.; Calcutta, 1856-88]).
- JAOS* American Oriental Society. *Journal* (New Haven etc., 1849—).
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern studies* (Chicago, 1942—).
- Khaṭīb Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. *Ta'rīkh Baghdād aw Madīnāt al-salām* (14 vols.; Cairo, 1931).
- KPA* Nabia Abbott. The Qurrah papyri from Aphrodito in the Oriental Institute (Chicago. University. The Oriental Institute. Studies in ancient oriental civilization, No. 15 [Chicago, 1938]).

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Lane	Edward W. Lane. An Arabic-English lexicon . . . Book I (London and Edinburgh, 1863-93).
<i>Ma'ārif</i>	'Abd Allāh ibn Muslim ibn Qutaibah. <i>Kitāb al-ma'ārif</i> (Handbuch der Geschichte), ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1850).
<i>Majallah</i>	<i>Majallat al-Majma' al-'ilmī al-'Irāqī</i> (Journal of the 'Irāqī Academy, <i>Baghdād</i>) (Baghdād, 1950—).
Maqdisī	Al-Muṭahhar ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī. <i>Kitāb al-bad' wa-al-ta'rīkh</i> (Le livre de la création et de l'histoire), ed. Clément Huart (6 vols.; Paris, 1899-1919).
Mas'ūdī	'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain al-Mas'ūdī. <i>Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādin al-jawāhir</i> (Les prairies d'or), ed. Charles Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille (9 vols.; Paris, 1861-1917).
<i>Mizān</i>	Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Dhahabī. <i>Mizān al-i'tidāl fī tarājim al-rijāl</i> (3 vols.; Cairo, 1325 A.H.).
Muslim	Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj. <i>Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī</i> (18 vols.; Cairo, 1929-30).
Nawawī	Yahyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī. <i>Kitāb tahdhīb al-asmā' wa-al-lughāt</i> (Biographical dictionary), ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1842-47).
<i>OIP L</i>	Nabia Abbott. The rise of the North Arabic script and its Qur'ānic development, with a full description of the Qur'ān manuscripts in the Oriental Institute (Chicago. University. Oriental Institute publications L [Chicago, 1939]).
<i>PERF</i>	Vienna. Nationalbibliothek. Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer. Führer durch die Ausstellung (Wein, 1894).
Sam'ānī	'Abd al-Karīm ibn Abī Bakr al-Sam'ānī. <i>Kitāb al-ansāb</i> ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" series XX [Leyden and London, 1912]).
<i>Sīrah</i>	'Abd al-Malik ibn Hishām. <i>Kitāb sīrat rasūl Allāh</i> (Das Leben Muhammed's), ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (2 vols.; Göttingen, 1858-60). References are to Vol. I unless otherwise stated.
Ṭabarī	Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī. <i>Ta'rīkh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk</i> (Annales), ed. Michael Jan de Goeje (15 vols.; Lugduni Batavorum, 1879-1901).
<i>Tafsīr</i>	Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī. <i>Ḍamī' al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān</i> (30 vols. and Index; Cairo, 1903).
<i>Tanbīh</i>	'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain al-Mas'ūdī. <i>Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-al-ishrāf</i> , ed. Michael Jan de Goeje (<i>BGA</i> VIII [1894]).
<i>Tījān</i>	'Abd al-Malik ibn Hishām. <i>Kitāb al-tījān</i> (Ḥaidarābād, 1347 A.H.).
Tirmidhī	Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī. <i>Ṣaḥīḥ</i> (13 vols.; Cairo, 1931-34).
Ṭūsī	Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī. <i>Fihrist kutub al-Shī'ah</i> , ed. Aloys Sprenger and Mawlawy 'Abd al-Ḥaqq (Bibliotheca Indica XIX [Calcutta, 1853-55]).
Wāqidi	Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Wāqidi. <i>Kitāb al-maghāzī</i> , ed. Alfred von Kremer (Bibliotheca Indica XXVIII [Calcutta, 1856]).
Wellhausen	Julius Wellhausen. Muhammed in Medina. Wāqidi's <i>Kitāb al-maghāzī</i> in verkürzter deutscher Wiedergabe (Berlin, 1882).
Ya'qūbī	Aḥmad ibn Abī Ya'qūb ibn Wāḍih al-Ya'qūbī. <i>Ta'rīkh</i> (Historiae), ed. M. T. Houtsma (2 vols.; Lugduni Batavorum, 1883).
Yāqūt	Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh. <i>Kitāb mu'jam al-buldān</i> (Geographisches Wörterbuch), ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (6 vols.; Leipzig, 1866-73; reprinted in 1924).
<i>ZDMG</i>	Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift (Leipzig, 1847-1943; Wiesbaden, 1950—).
<i>ZS</i>	Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete (Leipzig, 1922-35).

The following symbols are used in the Arabic printed texts:

[]	reconstructed or completely lost text
...	illegible traces
○	punctuation in the original texts

INTRODUCTION

THE eight documents here presented, together with Oriental Institute No. 14046, previously published,¹ form the main basis of the present study. They represent nine fields and periods of pre-Islāmic and early Islāmic history that range from the story of creation to military history in the tenth century of our era. The estimated dates of the papyrus fragments cover some two hundred years, roughly from about the mid-eighth to about the mid-tenth century. Furthermore, the documents represent, for the most part, the earliest Islāmic historians, even though some are not yet identified. Again, each papyrus fragment is undoubtedly the earliest known extant manuscript of the work it represents. Still unidentified are the authors of Documents 1, 2, and 3, which deal with the story of creation, Adam and Eve, and Jewish legendary history respectively. Tentatively identified are Oriental Institute No. 14046 and Documents 5 and 8, which, in all probability, trace back respectively to the lost works of Wahb ibn Munabbih's legendary history, Ma'mar ibn Rāshid's campaigns of Muḥammad, and Abū Muḥammad al-Faraghānī's continuation of Ṭabarī's history. On the other hand, Document 4 is definitely the earliest extant fragment of the well known *Sīrah* of Ibn Hishām, while Documents 6 and 7 represent the illusive *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* of Ibn Ishāq and the little known *Dhikr al-Nabī* of the Shī'ite Ibn 'Uqdah respectively. Both of these works were hitherto believed lost.

These papyrus documents have a threefold significance. The group as a whole has some bearing on the early history of literary scripts and scribal practices. Again, the group, though some documents more than others, is significant either for its actual historical contents or for the light it throws, directly or indirectly, on the cultural trends of the Umayyad and early 'Abbāsīd periods. But the group's greatest significance is for the study of the scope and method of early Islāmic historiography, evolving in a manuscript age. It becomes necessary, therefore, to integrate and interpret the evidence of these and related documents in respect to these fields of inquiry.

LITERARY SCRIPTS AND SCRIBAL PRACTICES

The orthographic signs and scribal devices used in these papyri are fully described in connection with the script of each document. All that is needed here is to co-ordinate and summarize these findings.

Scribal usages and devices show but slight variations from those already noted elsewhere in connection with the scripts of papyri from nonliterary fields. Words are split at the ends of lines (Documents, 1, 3, 6, and Oriental Institute No. 14046), though not quite so frequently as in nonliterary papyri. Diacritical marks, on the other hand, are more freely used in some of the present documents (Nos. 2 and 7) than in most nonliterary papyri. A stroke above *sin* (Document 7) and small letters under *hā'* and '*ain* (Documents 1, 4, 5, and 7) to distinguish them from their sister forms appear almost as rarely as in other fields. It is to be noted that the use of these letters in Document 5, dating from late in the second century of Islām, is earlier by some half a century than the earliest such usage hitherto known (see p. 61). Vowel signs are very rarely used (Documents 1 and 3), even in the verses that occur in these historical documents, while the *hamzah* is conspicuously absent in all of them.² The small circle, with or without a dot inside (Documents 1, 2, 5, 6, 8), and the inverted heart, with or

¹ "An Arabic papyrus in the Oriental Institute: Stories of the prophets," *JNES* V (1946) 169-80.

² This group adds little to one's knowledge of early dialects and grammar. The poetry fragments, yet to be published in this series, are more promising in con-

nection with such linguistic and literary studies as Chaim Rabin, *Ancient West-Arabian* (London, 1951) and Régis Blachère, *Histoire de la littérature arabe* (Paris, 1952—).

INTRODUCTION

without a vertical line through the middle (No. 4), seem to be the favorite devices for punctuation, though Oriental Institute No. 14046 has the circle with a number of dots around it. These signs appear also in nonliterary fields, which present one with a wider variety of punctuation marks.¹

A number of pious formulas are used. The *basmalah* or invocation of the name of Allāh, which makes its appearance in the earliest papyri known, is here used at the head of a major theme and of a subdivision of the text in Documents 6 and 5 respectively. But it is not possible to tell from these two instances whether or not such intertext use of the formula was general. Certainly it is not uniformly used in Document 5 in the transitions from the account of one campaign to that of another (see recto 18 and verso 13). Later practices would seem to limit the use of the formula to the beginning of a book and to its major divisions. The formula of the invocation of blessings on Muḥammad is freely used, though it is fluid in both usage and form in these documents (see p. 92). Pious invocations on any of the Companions are missing except for a single instance in the case of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (see p. 104), in Document 7, which is Shī'ite.

The exact sizes of the original pages are hard to determine from these broken fragments. Nevertheless the favored format is one that is nearly a square with the benefit of a doubt in favor of either a slightly greater width or a slightly greater length. Seven of the nine documents are of this format,² and it is possible that Document 8 also is of this format. Only Document 7, which is not a book folio but a rough sheet, presents the oblong format.

The over-all paleographic significance of this and other groups of literary papyri is linked with the problem of the classification of early scripts. Some of the earliest and fairly representative sources of information on the secretarial arts indicate that Arabic scripts were classified, almost from the start of the Islāmic period, relative to the field in which they were to be used. The earliest and most illustrative examples of this functional basis of classification are the Qur'ānic and chancellery scripts described elsewhere.³ Each of these fields had a group of scripts classified and subclassified according to functional, regional, and/or calligraphic variations. The question naturally arises: Was there a specific script or group of scripts associated primarily with the literary field and its many subdivisions? Christian Arabic scripts used largely and primarily for early Christian Arabic literature come to mind as a group in this connection.⁴

The great scarcity of early manuscript specimens and of tangible information in the available literary sources has left large gaps in our knowledge in this matter. A few examples are known where either a Qur'ānic or some chancellery script was used in some literary field.⁵ But in as much as these instances are few and far between, it has never been sufficiently clear whether they were or were not exceptions to the rule, especially in reference to such usage in the first two centuries of Islām. With the coming to light of this comparatively large group of papyri from several literary fields, it became possible to explore the problem a little more. Still, even at this stage, hardly more than a few suggestions can be made in regard to first-century usage, while any conclusions reached for second- and third-century practices must perforce remain tentative until the complete evidence of the remaining groups of literary documents, now in various stages of preparation by the present writer, is brought to bear on the subject.

The starting point of our inquiry is the script of a literary fragment in the papyrus collection of the University of Milan. The piece comes from a papyrus roll containing stories of the prophets. Only parts of five lines of text have survived. These list the names of *rusul* or prophets who had a special dispensation as against *anbiyā'* or prophets without such dispensation—a theme which occurs also in

¹ See Adolf Grohmann, *From the World of Arabic Papyri* (Cairo, 1952) pp. 91 f.

² The square or nearly square format is also that of the Heidelberg papyrus of the stories of the prophets (see Gertrude Mélamède, *Le monde oriental* XXVIII [1934] plates between pp. 56 and 57, for reproductions) and of the *ġāmi' fī al-ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb (ed. Jean

David-Weill; see Vol. I [Cairo, 1939]).

³ See the writer's *OIP* L and "Arabic paleography," *Ars Islamica* VIII (1941) 65–104.

⁴ *OIP* L 20 f.

⁵ See *ibid.* pp 19 f. and *Ars Islamica* VIII 81 ff. and references cited in both works. See *Irshād* VI 427 for Ṭabari's use of large scripts for Qur'ānic readings.

Oriental Institute No. 14046.¹ Grohmann has published the Milan fragment but unfortunately without a reproduction.² He likens its large, heavy, angular script, unpointed and unvoiced, to that of the earliest Qur'āns known and dates the fragment on this paleographic evidence to the first/seventh century. Even if we accept this early dating—Grohmann reassures me in private correspondence that the fragment is indeed very old—a single fragment dated on the basis of paleography alone is slim evidence of first-century practices. In order, therefore, to form even a tentative idea about early literary scripts one must proceed, by analogy, from what is known about the nonliterary scripts of that early period, that is, Qur'ānic and chancery scripts.

First-century administrative papyri afford definite proof of the diversification of scripts as to style, size, and function. First- and second-century Qur'āns indicate similar diversification, which is further confirmed by the sources. Even the few inscriptions and coins that have survived from the first century indicate some script diversification in the second half of that century.³ It would seem reasonable, therefore, to expect some diversification in contemporary literary scripts. One of the bases of such diversification could have been, as in the Qur'ānic and chancery groups, functional usage—perhaps a broad classification into two types, the one for religious and the other for secular works. Two such types could have been, in the earliest decades of Islām, no different from the monumental and the manuscript hands associated with the Qur'ānic and the administrative scripts respectively. Specific diversification may have come with the language reforms of 'Abd al-Malik (65–86/685–705), when Arabic replaced other languages in governmental bureaus. The increased literary activity of the time, in both the religious and the secular fields, may have led to further diversification toward religious and secular types of literary scripts. Authors or copyists of religious and secular works could have consciously or unconsciously patterned their scripts after the Qur'ānic and the bureau script respectively, by adoption or adaptation of some of the new scripts rapidly developing in these fields. Proof or disproof of such a development must await further evidence than is at present available. It should be noted, however, that what little we do know of early script practices tends to support these suggestions.⁴

Our knowledge of the scripts of the second and third centuries is based on somewhat firmer ground. For most of the literary papyri known, including the present group, date from this period. Furthermore, works on the secretarial arts are a little more explicit on the scripts of the time. Early authors concerned with the classification of scripts mention at least two scripts that were employed in literary fields though not necessarily limited to those fields. The first of these is the *qalam al-nassākh* or script of the copyists. Since special scripts or groups of scripts were developed for Qur'āns and for administrative and legal documents, professional copyists in these fields naturally used a script appropriate for the occasion. The *qalam al-nassākh*, therefore, must have been associated with copyists in the general pamphlet and book trade from its very inception in the second half of the first century of Islām, that is, with the appearance of the *warrāqūn*, who functioned as stationers, copyist-publishers, and book-sellers.⁵ This script is included in Aḥmad ibn Abī Khālid al-Aḥwal's (d. 210/825) classification. No description of it is available from before the time it received the attention of the famous calligrapher Ibn Muqlah (d. 328/940), who has been erroneously credited with its invention. To be readily usable and adequately suitable for literary purposes, the copyist script had to be, above all things, simple and legible. The *qalam al-nassākh* emerges finally as a small cursive book hand, not too angular nor yet too rounded. It is devoid of even the simplest of ornamental features, that is, the *tarwīs* or hooked head of a vertical stroke. Its one positive characteristic is the "open eyes" of the letters 'ain, ghain, fā', qāf, mīm, hā', and waw, that is, the careful execution of their heads with each stroke given its full

¹ JNES V 176–78.

² *Papiri della R. Università di Milano*, ed. Achille Vogliano et al., I (Milan, 1937) 243 f.

³ See OIP L, Pls. II–III. Perhaps also Christian Arabic scripts provide a parallel, though this group needs fuller analysis and re-examination as to the dating

of its earliest specimens (*ibid.* pp. 20 f.).

⁴ Cf. *Fihrist*, pp. 6, 8, and Abbott in *Ars Islamica* VIII 76 and 81 f.

⁵ See OIP L 36–38 and references there cited; Nuwairī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-'adab* IX (Cairo, 1933) 220 f.; also p. 24 below.

due so that the strokes are not run together into nondescript "closed spots" of ink, which would thus render the script illegible in respect to the above-mentioned letters. In the hands of a careful writer or copyist, the letters of this script were carefully formed, the words written fairly close together, and the lines kept straight and regular. But in the hands of a careless author or a hasty copyist for the ordinary book trade, the execution of the script was inferior and as such was disapprovingly referred to as *min namṭ al-warraqin*, "in the manner of the copyist-booksellers."¹ The *qalam al-nassākh* emerging as the *naskhī*-pen proper developed its own varieties. The heavy and the light *naskhī* were used for the text and the marginal notations respectively. When used in elegant books with considerable space allowed between the words it was known as the *manthūr* or scattered variety.²

The second early script that is specifically associated with literary fields, though again not limited to these fields, is the *qalam al-mudawwar al-ṣaghīr* or the small round script, derived from its larger variety better known as *qalam al-riyāṣī*, named after its supposed inventor, Faḍl ibn Sahl Dhū al-Riyāsatain (d. 200/816), secretary and prime minister of the Caliph Ma'mūn.³ This was a general and composite pen, *jāmi'*, widely used for registers, Tradition, and poetry—*al-dafātir wa-al-ḥadīth wa-al-ash'ār*. Since *daftar* covers all sorts of registers and account books as well as ordinary pamphlets and books (see pp. 24 f.), this script was put to use for administrative and commercial registers, where, then as now, neatness and clear legibility were the prime objectives. Such a script was equally suitable for Tradition and poetry, where assured legibility was of special importance for the protection of the accuracy of the text. Again, it is not likely that this script was limited, in the literary field, strictly to Tradition and poetry. Linguistic, legal, and historical themes touched these two fields at one point or another. In as much as no particular script or group of scripts is specifically associated with language, law, and history, it is not improbable that the *mudawwar al-ṣaghīr* was used at times in these fields also. Certainly this generally adequate script must have been appropriated for *akhbār*, which included not only history proper but also historical legends and all sorts of historical and biographical information relative to all the intellectual disciplines of the time. Furthermore, it should be noted in this connection, as in other connections, that in the final analysis every *ḥadīth* was a *khbar* and that these terms were frequently interchanged even though it was recognized that not every *khbar* was a *ḥadīth*.

Turning now to the evidence of our manuscripts, we find that the historical papyri present us with several types of cursive scripts. Even if we allow for local and personal variations, the scripts of Document 3 and Oriental Institute No. 14046 are carelessly executed book hands. They could very well represent the *naskhī* poorly executed in the manner of the bookseller-copyist. The scripts of Documents 1, 2, and 4 are more carefully executed cursive hands that probably represent early attempts at the true *naskhī*. The script of Document 5 is in a class of its own in this group; it is a little more rounded than the others, has hooked heads for some of its vertical strokes, and has a calligraphic quality more marked than in the others. It could be a variety of the *mudawwar al-ṣaghīr* definitely associated with *ḥadīth*. The document covers some of the campaigns of Muḥammad, and its text actually contains some of his *ḥadīth*. Document 6 is likewise in a class by itself. Neat and careful as the copy is, its paleography is comparatively primitive and amateurish. The script is more angular than any of the above-mentioned specimens. If it was meant for *naskhī*, then it is the *naskhī* not of a scholar or a commercial copyist but of a painstaking student not yet well schooled in the art of writing. Or again, it could represent the small angular Kūfic script, a variety of which is used in the Heidelberg papyrus of the stories of the prophets (see p. 2, n. 2). Document 7, a rough copy, is in the *muṭlaq* or vulgar hand frequently met with in all fields. The script of Document 8, despite the hooked heads of some of its verticals, may represent the last development of the old *naskhī* before the script reforms of Ibn Muqlah took effect.

¹ See OIP L 37; Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb wa-thamar al-albāb*, on the margins of 'Iqd II 120 f.; *Ars Islamica* VIII 93 f.

² Nuwairī, *op cit.* Vol. IX 222.

³ *Fihrist*, p. 8; see also OIP L 31 and 34 and references there cited.

Taken together the evidence of the papyri and that of the sources on scripts and secretarial practices would seem to indicate primacy of the *naskhī* for all or most literary purposes, with the *mudawwar al-ṣaghīr*, which itself leans toward the *naskhī*, desirable for poetry, Tradition, and probably history. Whether or not other scripts had wide currency in one or more of the literary fields still remains to be seen. Further research and detailed analysis of the scripts of the remaining groups of literary papyri to be published in this series will no doubt throw further light on the question. For the time being, the main points to be kept in mind are that some scripts overlap in function; that generally speaking the characteristic details of any script, Qur'ānic, administrative, or literary, are quite minute;¹ and that most of our papyri antedate Ibn Muqlah's script reforms and the subsequent stabilization of script types.

HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTION

The sum total of new historical facts that so small a group of papyrus fragments could bring to light should not be expected to be great. But the very nature and paucity of the new facts that they do provide have an over-all significance for Islāmic historiography, which is to be discussed below. The few new facts themselves have a wide coverage of time and theme. They help to establish place (p. 42) and personal (pp. 72, 105) names. They yield some interesting linguistic variants (pp. 71, 73). They recover a pithy saying of Muḥammad (p. 74), an unknown verse of his court poet Ḥassān ibn Thābit (p. 72), and verses of a still unidentified poet (p. 111). They supply an interesting illustration of how numbers go astray to become greatly exaggerated, and they provide a truer basis for an estimate of the number of the fallen at Bi'r Ma'ūnah by giving us the earliest list of these yet known (pp. 72, 76 f.). They provide new evidence of Muḥammad's known ability to make the most of his opportunities and instances of the methods he used to win friends and influence people (pp. 71 f., 73, 76, 78). They uncover the earliest record of the remarkable teamwork of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ relative to the former's caliphal ambitions expressed at least as early as the reign of 'Umar I (p. 85). They throw new light on the persons and personalities involved in the first elective council of Islām (pp. 86, 97). They afford us what seem to be authentic army statistics and a few firsthand battle details of a major campaign of the war-torn reign of Muqtadir (pp. 110 ff.). Finally, they bring to light leaves from a long-lost work of Ibn Ishāq, *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* (Document 6), and Ibn 'Uqdah's *Dhikr al-Nabī* (Document 7). The last are major discoveries, yielding the earliest extant and definitely identifiable specimens of Sunnite and Shī'ite history respectively.

EARLY ISLĀMIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

The outstanding significance of these papyri lies not so much in the new historical facts, interesting and important as these are, as in the direct and indirect bearing these documents have on the "when", "why", and "how" of the origin and early method of Islāmic historiography and, through these questions, on the level of the general culture rapidly evolving in the still largely uncharted first century and a half of Islām, beginning with the life of Muḥammad.

Seven of the nine documents under consideration actually represent ideas and practices generally current in the second half of the second century of the Hijrah. Islām's second-century storytellers, reporters, and more serious historians took not only Islāmic but universal history, as they understood it, for their theme. Their interest extended to a wide variety of historical fields both secular and religious. When and under what incentives did this extensive interest in history first develop? By what means were its earliest results transmitted to the authors of these documents and to their earlier contemporaries?

¹ OIP L 17-38 and *Ars Islamica* VIII 73-78; see also Grohmann, *From the World of Arabic Papyri*, pp. 71 f., 74, 80 f.

The most recent attempt to bring together the few scattered sources and the several ideas bearing on these and related themes is to be found in a study by Franz Rosenthal.¹ He draws most of his materials from comparatively late sources, stopping, however, short of Ibn Khaldūn. Partly for this reason he is more concerned with the period between Ṭabarī and Ibn Khaldūn than with the pre-Ṭabarī period of Islāmic historiography. Considering the comparatively limited quantity of the earlier materials and the controversial nature of much of their content, Rosenthal's emphasis on the later period was to be expected up to a point. What is surprising is his far too generalized and at times paradoxical outlook on the first two centuries of Islāmic historiography. Caught in an unresolved struggle of subjectivity and the critical faculties,² he accepts "a very early date" for the beginnings of all forms of Islāmic historiography³—which as a field of scholarship was already in the service of Muslim law and religion around A.D. 700⁴—yet rejects the great majority of historians and histories that preceded Ibn Ishāq (d. 769).⁵ He gives little evidence of a fresh effort to evaluate critically the earliest sources relative to one and all of his expressed or tacit rejections, and at the same time he generally by-passes some recent critical studies undertaken by others for the extremely difficult pre-'Abbāsīd period. He has completely overlooked or ignored Johann Fück's researches⁶ and underestimated the contributions of Eduard Sachau⁷ and Joseph Horowitz,⁸ among others, to the understanding of the historiography of this early period. On the whole H. A. R. Gibb, in his study written about a dozen years earlier, takes a middle-of-the-road approach between the skeptics and the credulous and presents a more workable summary of this period of Islāmic historiography.⁹

Papyrus fragments on hand speak directly and authoritatively for an advanced stage of Islāmic historiography in the second half of the second century and, though they cannot speak so authoritatively for the practices of the first half of that century, they do, nevertheless, provide a link of continuity in the professional life of Ibn Ishāq, which ran its course in the Hijāz until 132/750 and in 'Irāq until his death in 152/769. At the other end of the period under consideration is the time of Muḥammad and the beginning of the writing-down of the Qur'ān and Tradition.

Whatever the Arab's sense and concept of history was or was not—the theme is highly controversial¹⁰—there can be no doubt that Muḥammad himself displayed a keen historical instinct and a confident awareness of the historical role he and his new community were playing in world history. He succeeded, by precept and by example, in rousing in his followers an activated interest in the course of human history from the creation of man to his ultimate end in this world and the next. The Qur'ān, with its stories of the creation, the prophets, the resurrection, and heaven and hell, supplied incentive enough for his followers to continue and expand this historical interest. Many are the Qur'ānic references to the lessons of history. The acts of both God and man provide warning and guidance that lead to true perception of the nature and course of history itself.¹¹ The lives of the prophets are particularly significant as historical examples.¹² The great preoccupation with the *ḥadīth* and the *sunnah* of Muḥammad was partly motivated by the desire of his followers to heed his warning and follow his guidance

¹ *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden, 1952); see pp. xi–xii for bibliographical references. The author promises a separate study on Ibn Khaldūn (*ibid.* p. 104, n. 5).

² *Ibid.* p. 16.

³ See *ibid.* p. 87 for the general statement; pp. 17 f., 61, 64 f., 81, 86 for the different forms.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 171.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 44 f., 52, 56, 61 f., 81, 165, 265. For comments on some of these historians and histories see below, pp. 7, 14 (n. 5), 16 (n. 5), 20 (n. 5), 93.

⁶ *Muḥammad ibn Ishāq: Literarhistorische Untersuchungen* (Frankfurt am Main, 1925).

⁷ See Rosenthal, *op. cit.* p. xii.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 62, n. 2; Horowitz' results are, for the most

part, ignored.

⁹ See his art. "Ta'rikh" in *EI* Supplement (1938) pp. 233–37.

¹⁰ See e.g. *ibid.* pp. 233 f.; also Rosenthal, *History of Muslim Historiography*, chap. ii.

¹¹ See e.g. Sūrahs 3:13, 12:43, 16:66, 47:31, 59:2, 79:26, 99:4. The commentaries of Ṭabarī, Baghawī, and Suyūṭī throw interesting light on some of these passages.

¹² E.g. Sūrahs 12:111, 15:49 f., 33:21; the last passage refers to Muḥammad himself. See also Arent Jan Wensinck, *Concordance et indices de la Tradition musulmane* (Leiden, 1936—) under *uswat*; the word 'ibrah used more generally to indicate the didactic use of history, is not yet indexed in this concordance.

as much in the affairs of the community as in their individual lives. It is not likely, therefore, that the utilitarian and moral aims of history were overlooked by the earliest Islāmic historians whose works have not survived. But no one who reads extensively in the *Ṣīrah* of Ibn Hishām and in the *Ta'rikh* of Ṭabarī, with the latter's extensive citations from earlier historians and traditionists, can fail to sense the didactic element in early Islāmic historiography. If Tradition, like the Qur'ān, provided positive commands and injunctions, history pointed to the consequence of heeding or ignoring these. The papyrus texts, fragmentary as they are, provide two references to the "lessons" to be learned from historical events, one in connection with the story of Adam and Eve (see p. 43) and one in connection with the trials and tribulations of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (see p. 104). Many historians from the third century on made special efforts to point out the lessons of history.¹ But it was Ibn Khaldūn who, by playing on the different shades of meaning of the word *'ibrah* and its plural *'ibar* in the title and text of his great history, *Kitāb al-'ibar*, and its greater *Muqaddimah*, sought to exhaust the "lessons of history" on the various levels of human action and thought, including the philosophy of history.²

It would seem, therefore, that from the start the Islāmic community reached out for all sorts of historical information, *khabar* (pl. *akhbār*), to explain and supplement the historical allusions of the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth*. In a general sense both *ḥadīth* and *khabar* mean a "report" or "information" irrespective of its nature or its source. But early in Islām *ḥadīth* acquired a specific technical meaning. It became a handy abbreviation of the phrase *ḥadīth al-Nabī*, "sayings of the Prophet," at the same time that the phrase *ḥadīth al-ṣaḥābah* or *athār al-ṣaḥābah* indicated the sayings of Muḥammad's Companions. These sayings were, as a rule, short and simple. In this same period *khabar*, as distinguished from technical *ḥadīth*, came to mean a short narrative or bits of related information from whatever source available. Strictly speaking every *ḥadīth* was a *khabar* but not every *khabar* was a *ḥadīth*. The two terms are therefore not interchangeable.³ Their distinction, particularly for this early period, must not be lost sight of, since it has a significant bearing on the rate of development and the method of transmission of the two related disciplines of Tradition and history.

It has been customary to look upon Islāmic historiography as an outgrowth of Tradition and to assume that history borrowed from the latter some of its concepts and all of its method of transmission.⁴ This idea is no more tenable than the reverse would be, namely that Tradition is an outgrowth, in the same respects, of history. Neither in content nor yet in method of transmission can either discipline be seen as consistently dependent on the other throughout the first centuries of Islām with their rapid changes in the extent and level of culture. Islāmic Tradition and history were twin, though not identical, disciplines. In the first decades of Islām they were both primarily supplemental to the interpretation of the Qur'ān and to the recording of the life of Muḥammad and had for that reason a large area of duplication of content. They received the same degree of literary attention or lack of it until 'Umar I, strictly out of religious considerations, cast the die against a written standard collection of *ḥadīth*.⁵ This restriction, it is true, had the effect of discouraging the writing-down of *ḥadīth* among the more orthodox and pious, but it had little effect on the heterodox Khārijites and the less submissive of 'Umar's own generation and later generations among the faithful.⁶ Again, 'Umar's action laid no

¹ *Akhbār*, p. 393; Jāḥiẓ, *Rasā'il*, ed. Ḥasan al-Sandūbī (Cairo, 1933) pp. 133 f.; Mas'ūdī I 95, IV 111-14; Ibn Miskawaih, *Tajārib al-umam* ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series" VII [London, 1909-17]) I 3-6; *Irshād* I 28.

² See e.g. *Muqaddimah* (Bulāq, 1274) pp. 3, 4, 5, 17, including synonyms. See Muḥsin Mahdī, *Ibn Khaldūn's Philosophy of History* (London, 1956), for an instructive treatment of the history of the concept of *'ibrah* and of Ibn Khaldūn's interpretation of the same.

³ Rosenthal, who has taken great pains with the technical terms of Islāmic history, has nevertheless

fallen into this error; cf. his *History of Islamic Historiography*, pp. 10 f., 59.

⁴ Cf. references in n. 10 on p. 6 and see Jawād 'Alī "Mawārid ta'rikh al-Ṭabarī," *Majallah* I (Baghdād, 1950) 157 f.

⁵ Ibn Sa'd III 206, V 140; Goldziher, *Studien* II 194-202.

⁶ Ibn 'Asākir VI 384 f.; *Mizān* II 276; Goldziher, *Studien* II 131; Goldziher, "Kämpfe um die Stellung des Ḥadīth im Islām," *ZDMG* LXI (1907) 865 f.; Fück, "Die Rolle des Traditionalismus im Islām," *ZDMG* XCIII (1939) 9.

restriction on the writing-down of history, particularly secular history, both Islāmic and non-Islāmic. Hence, during the following few decades, while *ḥadīth* with its emerging *isnād* was being transmitted for the most part orally, historical accounts, *akhbār*, were being compiled from various sources, contemporary or ancient, Islāmic or non-Islāmic. These accounts were written down with slight or no attention to the new device of *isnād*. Even in the field of religious history, including the life of Muḥammad, the use of the *isnād* was a haphazard practice, perhaps only a little more so than it was in *ḥadīth* itself at that time. These statements are readily verifiable in works of unquestioned authority such as the *Sirah* of Ibn Hishām and the *Ta'rikh* of Ṭabarī. The latter author quotes extensively from early oral traditionists and from such authors as Ka'ab al-Akhbār and Wahb ibn Munabbih, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar and 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, who either provide few or no *isnād*'s at all or use the device indifferently and inconsistently.¹

'Umar's unfortunate decision against a written standard collection of *ḥadīth*, only partially effective from the start, came in time to be totally disregarded. Private collections such as had already been drawn to 'Umar's attention continued to grow in size and number with each passing generation, thanks to the absence of a controlling standard edition.² It was under such conditions that the paths of the traditionist and the historian converged once more. Together they evolved a new and subsidiary discipline—biography—and, for the time being, a common method of transmission, which is not to say that either one borrowed these from the other.

Religious and legalistic interests called for biographies of Islām's earliest traditionists, jurists, and theologians, while secular historical interests centered on biographies of caliphs, governors, and generals. The two streams of biographies overlapped to a great extent, beginning with the biographies of Muḥammad's Companions and of his followers in the next generation, many of whom qualified both as historical leaders and as men of learning, *ahl al-'ilm*. The term *'ilm* when unqualified meant a group of religious disciplines in which Tradition played a major role, *'ilm* being frequently and loosely equated with the science of *ḥadīth* and its several branches.³ The *Sirah* of Ibn Hishām includes many biographical episodes of Muḥammad's Companions, but none of the earlier monographs of individual biographies have survived. The *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd, the earliest national biography known, illustrates the difference between the method of biographical entry for early political leaders and that for scholars. Except for the entries on the most outstanding persons in each group, whose lives are treated in full detail under their respective classifications, the historical entries are, as a rule, more inclusive and therefore more in the nature of true biography. On the other hand, the entries on the rank and file of traditionists are much briefer and therefore form rather a national dictionary of *ḥadīth* scholars, intended as much to date and identify a man as a means of determining his reliability as a traditionist as to relate one or more of the traditions he transmitted. Again, because of the loss of the materials and works of Wahb, Ibn Ishāq, and Ibn Hishām which had the stories of creation and of the prophets for their themes, it is Ibn Sa'd who has preserved some of the earliest specimens, in abbreviated versions, of the biographies of the prophets, which are largely in the nature of historical legends. Islāmic biography, being the creature of history and Tradition, served these fields almost exclusively at first, though it was not long before first literature and then the physical sciences made full use of it. Not in any of its branches was there ever any restriction against or aversion to the writing-down of biography. It is not surprising, therefore, to find *sirah* and *siyar* so prominent in the titles of the very earliest prose works of Islām—works that antedate the original *Sirah* of Ibn Ishāq and which are at present lost to history and scholarship.⁴

¹ See Ṭabarī, Index, under these names.

² Jāḥiẓ (*Rasā'il* [Cairo, 1933] pp. 119–23) comments that if the generation which collected the Qur'ān in book form had made a (written) collection of the Prophet's "signs" (which include his sayings) no one in his (Jāḥiẓ') day would have been able to question their origin and accuracy.

³ This equation is quite readily seen in the chapters or sections devoted to *'ilm* in the standard collections of *ḥadīth* (e.g. Bukhārī I, Book iii; Muslim XVI 216–26; see also Goldziher, *Studien* II 176).

⁴ See *Fihrist*, pp. 93–100, for entries covering the period from Abū Mikhnaḥ to Ibn Sa'd. These are not to be confused with legendary history and biography

As the paths of the historian and the traditionist converged toward the close of the first century, the more serious historian, already committed to writing down most of his materials, adopted the *isnād*, which had in the meantime gained more weight and currency in *ḥadīth* proper. The traditionist, on the other hand, had become increasingly convinced of the need to "chain down" words, facts, and dates and was therefore prepared to give more weight than he had hitherto done to the written record, not only as an aid to memory but as a measure of control against oral fraud. Thus oral transmission was to continue but it was to go hand in hand with the written record (see pp. 13, 22 f., 52 ff.).

Though sharing the mechanics of transmission, the traditionist and the historian were drawing apart in the treatment of their subject matter. The traditionist, aiming at strict literal accuracy, could take no stylistic liberties with the *matn* or content of each tradition. The historian, on the other hand, was all but free from this restriction and so had a fairly wide margin of stylistic free play. He soon evolved the handy device of listing his chief authorities at the head of his work and at each of its main divisions and then combining their several reports into an integrated account of a major historical event or a series of related events. The comparatively short and simple *ḥabār*, still essential as a source and useful in spots as a device, thus evolved in the hands of the historian into the much easier and more manageable historical narrative. This evolution is fully illustrated in what has survived of the historical works of Ibn Ishāq and Wāqidi, both of whom were formal and methodical historians displaying a measure of tacit criticism in the very selectivity and/or brevity of their work. As the font of Tradition, authentic or not, dried up in the course of the second century while that of history increased the volume of its flow, the traditionist and the historian parted to go their separate ways, but not before each had left his mark on the other, a mark that was renewed and intensified when the historian and the traditionist were one and the same person, as was the case with Ṭabarī among others. In his great *Ta'rikh*, Ṭabarī the traditionist is ever at the elbow of Ṭabarī the historian, and in his lengthy *Tafsīr*, the historian is equally at the elbow of the traditionist and commentator. Nevertheless, to continue to treat the first steps in the evolution of Islāmic Tradition and in that of Islāmic historiography as identical in method but exclusive in content is to do double violence to both disciplines, since in their inception and early growth these disciplines though intimately associated in both method and content were neither identical in the former nor yet exclusive in the latter. On the other hand, some of Ṭabarī's older contemporaries and most of his immediate successors, historians of the caliber of Ya'qūbī, Mas'ūdī, and Maqdisī, all but threw off the shackles of the method of Tradition and came increasingly to treat historical themes on which Tradition had little or no bearing. The twin disciplines, despite their early ties of content and method, each came at last to assert its own identity and to elaborate its own methods.

Still another factor that favored the writing-down of history and Tradition in this early pre-'Abbāsīd period, with or without the benefit of parallel oral transmission, was the interest that several of the Umayyads took in either or both of the subjects. As rulers of the new Islāmic community and state, the more able members of the dynasty sought in each subject some knowledge or guidance for "rightly ordering the affairs of the nation". If *ḥadīth* provided or could be made to provide positive commands and injunctions, *ta'rikh* translated these into action and pointed a moral for either heeding or ignoring them. But, although history is conceded as the "royal science" much in fashion at court and in high society, Umayyad interest in history is too frequently either overlooked or categorically rejected on the basis of some general assumption incapable as yet of either proof or disproof. In as much as the first major reference to royal Umayyad interest in history is the controversial story of Mu'āwiyah and the *akḥbār* 'Ubad ibn Sharyah, it becomes necessary to digress at this point in order to re-examine the story and its implications in the light of present knowledge.

The earliest known form of the story dates from the first half of the third century and is found in the introductory remarks of one of the Barqī brothers (see p. 63) as editor-transmitter of *Akḥbār*

of this time such as are to be found in *Fihrist*, pp. 304-6. working on an unpublished manuscript (no date specified) of the *Sīrah*.
Alfred Guillaume informs me, by letter, that he is

'*Ubaid*.¹ According to this version Mu'āwiyah, toward the end of his long and successful life, found his greatest pleasure in prolonged evening sessions devoted to conversation about men and events of the past. 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, always on intimate terms with Mu'āwiyah, suggested that he send for 'Ubaid, an aged Yemenite famed for his knowledge of the Arabs and their past. This was done, and 'Ubaid soon became Mu'āwiyah's favorite evening companion, helping him to while away the nights and drive away worry with his informative and entertaining conversation. So impressed was Mu'āwiyah with 'Ubaid's store of knowledge about the Arabs, their poetry, and their history that he ordered members of his administrative personnel and his (own) secretaries to take down (*yurwaqqi'ūhu*) 'Ubaid's narration and to collect it in books (*yudawwintūhu*). This order definitely suggests rough note-taking at the time of the conversations and later editing of the notes for permanent record and future use. Mas'ūdī confirms this story and adds that these and other historical materials were later read back to Mu'āwiyah by his scribes and court attendants.² 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, groups of Quraishites, and others were frequently present at these sessions. Hence from the start *Akhbār 'Ubaid* had a good chance to become widely known in a number of oral and written versions, as the fourth-century Hamdānī discovered.³ Famous early traditionists such as Makḥūl of Syria (d. 112/730),⁴ historians, and men of letters from Ibn Ishāq⁵ and Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī⁶ onward have taken note of 'Ubaid or his work, generally citing him, in the fashion of Islāmic scholarship, by name rather than by the title of his work, though the latter does appear now and again.⁷ Third-century scholars of the caliber of Jāḥiẓ and Ibn Qutaibah, contemporaries of the editor-transmitter Barqī, noted some of 'Ubaid's shortcomings or questioned this or that legendary accretion about him⁸ or his subjects. Jāḥiẓ, who draws attention to 'Ubaid's superficial treatment and understanding of the events he narrates, nevertheless mentions him repeatedly in glowing terms, referring to him as historian and genealogist.⁹ Again, Ibn Qutaibah, though he questions 'Ubaid's story on Thamūd, does not question his authorship of the *Akhbār*.¹⁰ Attention has already been drawn to the recognition of 'Ubaid by Mas'ūdī and by 'Ubaid's fellow Yemenite, Hamdānī. The latter lists 'Ubaid among his chief sources of, and frequently cites him in, the *Iklīl*.¹¹

¹ Published at the end of *Tījān* (pp. 311–492); cf. *GAL S I* 100. It is not stated in the *Akhbār* which of the three Barqī brothers is involved.

² See *Akhbār*, pp. 212 f., 214. Cf. *Fihrist*, pp. 89 f.; *Irshād V* 13. See also Mas'ūdī III 173–75, IV 89, V 77 f.; *Tanbih*, p. 82. The tendency has been to consider night sessions as either trivial or worldly and to overlook the fact that from the start some statesmen and scholars devoted part of the night to serious literary and religious discussions (see e.g. Bukhārī I 41 under *Bab al-samar fī al-ʿilm*). Mas'ūdī's repeated references to 'Ubaid and his work indicate direct knowledge of the work, which he describes as well known in his own day and accepted by him and others as the ultimate source of most pre-Islāmic Yemenite history apart from the Hīran traditions (see *Akhbār*, pp. 472 f., for some of the latter).

³ See references cited in n. 2 and cf. *Iṣābah III* 201 f.; this is not too surprising considering the legendary nature of the contents of *Akhbār 'Ubaid*.

⁴ *Tījān*, p. 209; cf. Hamdānī, *Al-iklīl al-jiz' al-thāmin*, ed. Anistās Mārī al-Karmālī (Baghdād, 1931) pp. 183 f.

⁵ E.g. *Tījān*, pp. 66, 209. ⁶ *Iṣābah III* 201.

⁷ E.g. Mas'ūdī IV 89; *Iṣābah III* 202 (cf. below, p. 24).

⁸ 'Ubaid lived to a great age, which, according to the printed version of the *Akhbār* (p. 313), was no more

than 150 years as guessed by 'Ubaid himself. The exaggeration that 'Ubaid permitted himself here was soon increased by others to several hundred years; see Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-mu'ammārīn* (Ignaz Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie II* [Leiden, 1899]) pp. 4 f.

⁹ Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-bukhalā*, ed. Gerlof van Vloten (Leyde, 1900) p. 49 (= ed. Taḥa al-Ḥājirī [Cairo, 1948] pp. 40, 284); Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) III 210; Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-bayān wa-al-tabyīn* (Cairo, 1947) I 342 f., where the editor gives 67/686 as the death date of 'Ubaid without, however, mentioning his authority for it. Most of the sources already quoted state that 'Ubaid died in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik.

It should be mentioned here that 'Ubaid himself claimed no knowledge of the hidden or deep meanings of some of the passages of the Qur'ān, except to note the fact that such meanings existed, according to what he had heard from Ibn 'Abbās (see *Akhbār*, pp. 419 f.).

¹⁰ Ibn Qutaibah, *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Cairo, 1326) p. 340.

¹¹ See Oscar Löfgren, *Ein Hamdānī-Fund; über das Berliner Unicum der beiden ersten Bücher des Iklīl* ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1935, No. 7.) p. 24, where Hamdānī lists a number of 1st-century genealogists, including 'Ubaid and Dagħfal, among his chief sources, though his best praise is reserved for the senior Kalbī. See also Karmālī's edition of the *Iklīl*, pp. 24, 71, 183 f.,

Western scholarship has in recent times questioned not only 'Ubaid's authorship of the *Akhbār* but the man's very historicity. The discovery of the manuscripts of the *Akhbār* and their subsequent use by Fritz Krenkow led the latter to publish a hasty note on the work and its author prior to its publication in Ḥaidarābād.¹ Through a remarkable series of factual errors and general assumptions Krenkow arrived at the conclusion that "there cannot be any doubt that he ('Ubaid) is an entirely fictitious person" and that "it appears that Muḥammad ibn Ishāq is the original author of the work", which he further suggests was very probably edited by Ibn Hishām.² In as much as such statements will continue to influence readers in regard to the controversy on 'Ubaid and his work,³ the reasons for Krenkow's statements must be critically examined so that we may ascertain the facts and clarify the issue.

To start with, Krenkow, noting that 'Ubaid does not appear to have found a place among the biographies of traditionists,⁴ assumed the reason to be simply that he was an entirely fictitious person. Actually, there is no reason why 'Ubaid the *akhbārī* should be included among the traditionists. For, though he lived partly in Muḥammad's time, it is expressly stated that he did not hear any traditions from Muḥammad. Furthermore, his antiquarian interests did not call for knowledge of Islāmic Tradition. He had occasion, now and again, to refer to a Qur'ānic passage or its interpretation and drew for the most part on 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās for the latter.⁵ Again, Krenkow misread Barqī's introductory paragraph and in so doing reversed the role of author and editor, so as to make the third-century Barqī the author and the first-century 'Ubaid the transmitter,⁶ an absurd situation, which is used by Krenkow to cast further doubt on 'Ubaid's authorship of the *Akhbār*. Again, failing to realize that an editorial note, supplementing the account of the supposed conquest of Samarqand by Shamar (Samar) the Ḥimyarite, has been absorbed into the text, Krenkow cited the passage to cast still further doubt on 'Ubaid's authorship by pointing to the absurdity of 'Ubaid's describing to Mu'āwiyah, who died in A.H. 61, the conquest of Samarqand, which did not take place until A.H. 87. But the text says no such thing. 'Ubaid has just finished telling Mu'āwiyah of a Ḥimyarite inscription erected by Shamar reading: "He who comes thus far is my equal, but he who goes further is greater than I." 'Ubaid concludes with the pious hope that God may grant Mu'āwiyah the victory over Samarqand, for then he, Mu'āwiyah, will know that 'Ubaid spoke out of true knowledge. To this Mu'āwiyah replies: "May God show us the proof of Ibn Sharyah's statement." It is at this point that the editor inserted a note to the effect that he (the editor) had heard on the authority of 'Āmir al-Sha'bī (d. between 95 and 110, the most preferred date being 103/721) that when Samarqand was actually taken by the Muslims its conqueror, Qutaibah ibn Muslim, saw this very inscription and had it translated and that the text turned out to be just what 'Ubaid had told Mu'āwiyah it was.⁷ Furthermore, there seems to be even

215, 217, 232-35, 251, 262, where 'Ubaid is cited. Karmalī repeatedly draws attention to the legendary nature of the tales and to some interpolations, but he does not question 'Ubaid's historicity (e.g. Karmalī's notes on pp. 71, 233, 251). His n. 1 on p. 217 confuses two separate traditions, as does also his n. 6 on pp. 265 f., where the story cited is to be found not in the *Akhbār* but in the *Tijān*.

Hamdānī's introductory comments in Book I of the *Iklīl*, recently published, make abundantly clear that he, like Jāḥiẓ, was fully aware of the disorganized and inadequate information, particularly in reference to South Arabian history, of 1st-century Muslim genealogists and historians including the very men whom he quotes freely and repeatedly. It is also clear from some of these comments that Hamdānī was aware of the progressive developments in the writing of genealogy and history as evidenced in the successive works of the senior Kalbī, Ibn Ishāq, and Hamdānī's direct source, Abū Naṣr, whose own sources included manuscript as well as inscriptional South Arabic materials. See

Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, Book I, ed. Oscar Löfgren ("Bibliotheca Eckmaniana" LVIII 1 [Uppsala, 1954]) pp. 3-6, 13.

¹ Krenkow collated the Ḥaidarābād copy with one in Berlin and with another in the British Museum, but the final editing of the text was done by Sayyid Zain al-'Ābidīn al-Mūsawī of Ḥaidarābād (see *Akhbār*, pp. 490f.).

² Krenkow, "The two oldest books on Arabic folklore," *Islamic Culture* II (1928) 235 f.

³ See e.g. Ruth Stellhorn Mackensen, "Arabic books and libraries in the Umayyad period," *AJSL* LIII (1936/37) 247 f. See also below (p. 16, n. 5).

⁴ He is mentioned, however, by Ibn Qutaibah and has an entry in the *Iṣābah*.

⁵ Cf. *Akhbār*, pp. 326 f., 336, 352, 365-66, 373, 377, 384, 387 f., 415 f., 419, 433; cf. also n. 9 on p. 10 above.

⁶ The editor of the printed text (see n. 1) has suggested, in a footnote, the correct reading of the text, which needs but slight emendation.

⁷ *Akhbār*, pp. 429 f.; esp. p. 430, lines 1 f. and 5-16;

an excellent historical reason for this seemingly wishful conversation between 'Ubaid and Mu'āwiyah. Sa'id ibn 'Uthmān, Mu'āwiyah's governor of Khurāsān, laid siege to Samarqand in A.H. 56. The city saw fit to negotiate a truce and to deliver to Sa'id a large number of hostages. Since Mu'āwiyah died in A.H. 61, the year of the siege can certainly be considered as being "toward the end of his life," when 'Ubaid was summoned to his court. It is, therefore, entirely possible that 'Ubaid's and Mu'āwiyah's wish for victory over Samarqand had reference to this very expedition of Sa'id ibn 'Uthmān against that great city.¹ It turns out, then, that every argument brought forth by Krenkow against the authorship and historicity of 'Ubaid is based on some misconception or misreading of the *Akhbār* text.

Krenkow's suggestion that Ibn Hishām was probably the editor of the *Akhbār* would at first seem to have some merit. But when he suggests that the links in the transmission are Barqī on the authority of Ibn Hishām on the authority of Asad ibn Mūsā (132–212/750–827), after the analogy of the combined *isnād*'s for the *Ṣirah* (Barqī on the authority of Ibn Hishām) and the *Tījān* (Ibn Hishām on the authority of Asad ibn Mūsā), he again goes astray, this time on the identity of Asad, whom he describes as a Yemenite and therefore interested in showing up the glories of the South Arabians.² Actually Asad ibn Mūsā's genealogy reads as follows: Asad ibn Mūsā ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān al-Umawī; that is, Asad, far from being a Yemenite, like Ibn Hishām, was none other than the great-grandson of the Umayyad Caliph Walid I. He had settled in Egypt, was known as a historian (*akhbārī*), and had won a reputation as Asad al-Sunnah.³ If in spite of these facts the *isnād*'s still seem to favor Ibn Hishām's editorship of the *Akhbār*, there are other factors that seem to outweigh the *isnād*'s as evidence. The internal evidence of the *Tījān* and the *Akhbār*, as shown by comparison of their content and method, is against it. Ibn Hishām, as editor-transmitter of the *Tījān* of Wahb, is freely given to editorial comment either on his sole authority or on the authority of others, in which latter case he quite frequently introduces full *isnād*'s, in only two of which is 'Ubaid mentioned as his final authority.⁴ This is likewise his practice in his recension of the *Ṣirah* of Ibn Ishāq, where, it should be noted, 'Ubaid is not cited at all. On the other hand, Ibn Hishām does not appear at all in the text of the *Akhbār* either as editor or as transmitter. Again, though the *Tījān* and the *Akhbār* have some characters and events in common, the treatment of these people and events is quite different in the two works, giving no evidence whatsoever of editorial characteristics that can be said to be common to both or that betray the same editorial hand. This difference is quite clearly and significantly illustrated in connection with the anecdote of the conquest of Samarqand already cited above. The editorial passage in the *Akhbār* merely mentions 'Āmir al-Sha'bī as its source while the parallel editorial passage in the *Tījān* is introduced with a full *isnād* that goes back to the same 'Āmir al-Sha'bī and reads in full: "Abū Muḥammad (= Ibn Hishām) said 'Āmir ibn Jurham al-Anṣārī related to me on the authority of Makḥūl on the authority of ('Āmir) al-Sha'bī, who said. . . ." The fact that Ibn Hishām heads the *isnād* for the supplementary comment in the *Tījān* but is not mentioned in connection with a parallel passage in the *Akhbār* strengthens greatly the other arguments against the probability of his editorship of the latter.

Still to be examined is Krenkow's suggestion that Ibn Ishāq appears to be the original author of

read "'Abd Allāh" instead of "Mu'āwiyah" at the end of line 12 and see *Tījān*, p. 237, line 3, for this correction. It is definitely clear from this passage that the conversation on p. 430, lines 10–16, is between 'Abd Allāh al-Khaiwānī and his tent-mate, 'Uthmān ibn Abī Sa'id al-Khaiwānī, who read the inscription of Shamar for Qutaibah ibn Muslim. 'Āmir al-Sha'bī had served as secretary to Qutaibah (see *EI* III 243).

¹ Ṭabarī II 177–80; cf. Yāqūt III 133–37. The city had several subsequent encounters with the Muslims before its final conquest by Qutaibah ibn Muslim (cf. e.g. Ya'qūbī, *Kitāb al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, *BGA* VII [2d ed.; 1892] 293 f., 297 f., 300; Ṭabarī II 488,

1178–82, 1241; *Ma'ārif*, p. 281).

² *Islamic Culture* II 231, 236; Krenkow's one source (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb* I 260) is not available to me.

³ Dhahabī I 363 f.; *Mizān* I 97; *GAL* I 66 and S I 257. Others (following *GAL* I 66) have confused the date of his birth with that of his death, thus making him much too early (e.g. Reynold A. Nicholson, *A Literary History of the Arabs* [2d ed.; Cambridge, 1930] p. 247; Mackensen in *AJSL* LII [1935/36] 250).

⁴ *Tījān*, pp. 66, 209; for the other *isnād*'s see pp. 75, 125, 132, 135, 163, 175, 203, 212 f., 237, 240, 243, 251, 262, 292.

the *Akhhbār*. Krenkow¹ draws attention to only one of the four instances where Ibn Ishāq is mentioned in the *Akhhbār*. Careful examination of each instance in the wider context of the text leaves no room for doubt that in all four instances it is the editor-transmitter who supplements 'Ubad's original *Akhhbār* with materials taken from the *written* works of Ibn Ishāq and that in each instance Ibn Ishāq himself had drawn from sources other than 'Ubad. Three of the four passages occur in connection with the story of Ṣāliḥ and Thamūd,² and each passage is introduced not with *qāla Ibn Ishāq* but with *dhakara Ibn Ishāq*. While *qāla* is the verb invariably used when an author or a transmitter is referring to himself, *dhakara* generally indicates quotation from *written* works, as shown on page 53. The fourth instance where Ibn Ishāq is mentioned is in connection with the story of Hūd or 'Ād. Here again the supplementary passage begins with *dhakara*, but Ibn Ishāq is only a link in a long *isnād* that goes back to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, so it is clear that here too the editor is using some *written* source for materials derived from authorities other than 'Ubad.³ Having completed his comment the editor draws attention in each of the four instances to the fact that the account returns to resume the narrative of 'Ubad.

The mention of Ibn Ishāq in the *Akhhbār* on authorities other than 'Ubad can mean only one of two directly opposite possibilities. Either Ibn Ishāq is to be intimately associated with the work as author or chief editor, or he is to be dissociated from the work in either of these roles. Krenkow, believing 'Ubad to be fictitious and Ibn Hishām to be the editor of the *Akhhbār*, favored the first of these two possibilities and forced Ibn Ishāq into the role of author on the strength of a single citation in the *Akhhbār*. Actually the facts point much more clearly in the direction of the second possibility, even with four citations instead of one citation of Ibn Ishāq in the *Akhhbār*. For from what is now known of Ibn Ishāq's interests and method as seen in Ibn Hishām's recension of his *Sirah* and as directly illustrated by his *Ta'riḥ al-khulafā'* (see our Document 6), it is highly improbable that either Ibn Ishāq, in referring to himself, or any editor of his work would fail to use the terminology accepted as indicating authorship, namely, *qāla Ibn Ishāq*. This phrase should have been used not once nor yet four times but literally dozens of times, as *qāla Abū Muḥammad* and *qāla Wahb* are used in the *Tijān* and as *qāla Ibn Hishām* and *qāla ibn Ishāq* are used in the *Sirah*.

Again, Ibn Ishāq's interests are known to have centered on the creation, prophecy from Adam to Muḥammad, the life of the latter, and the history of the caliphs. Nowhere is he associated with an interest in the history of non-Arabs or of Arabs of the north or south as such, except where their history touches one or more of his major interests. Such being the case, Ibn Ishāq would be expected to take interest in such works as the *Tijān* and the *Akhhbār* at points where they could contribute not so much to the history of the Persians and of the South Arabians as to the stories of the creation and the prophets. This means that the bulk of the *Tijān* and of the *Akhhbār* held little interest for him. This assumption is factually borne out by the nature of Ibn Ishāq's citations from Wahb in the works of such authors as Ṭabarī, Mas'ūdī, and Maqdisī, most of which citations deal with the creation and the prophets. Again, it is borne out by the rarity and the nature of Ibn Hishām's editorial citation of Ibn Ishāq in the *Tijān* itself, in which, furthermore, Ibn Ishāq is mentioned only once as drawing on 'Ubad. This clearly indicates that Ibn Ishāq and Wahb had not much in common so far as the chief subject of the *Tijān* is concerned.⁴ And in so much as the *Tijān* and the *Akhhbār* have much in common as to subjects, Ibn Ishāq would have no more interest in the latter than in the former. In other words,

¹ *Islamic Culture* II 236, quoting Ḥaidarābād manuscript folio 142 (= *Akhhbār*, p. 378).

² *Akhhbār*, pp. 378, 381, 394.

³ See *Akhhbār*, p. 350, where the word *ghair* should be restored before "'Ubad" in order to fit the logic of the passage (cf. *Sūrah* 11).

⁴ *Tijān*, pp. 66, 75, 175, 212, 251, 292. Wahb is quoted just once by the editor of the *Akhhbār*, and that citation, too, is in connection with the story of the

prophet Ṣāliḥ (*Akhhbār*, p. 379).

Book I of Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, published after the above passage was written, confirms the observation that Ibn Ishāq's interest in South Arabian history was primarily in connection with the stories of the prophets (see *Iklīl*, Book I, ed. Löfgren [1954] pp. 10-13, 16, 29, 32 f., 48, 55 f.). Hamdānī's sizable quotations of Ibn Ishāq are probably from the latter's *Kitāb al-mubtadā'* (cf. pp. 87-89 below).

his concern with the *Akhhbār* would be not primary, that is, in the role of either author or major editor-transmitter, but incidental and touching only the few points bearing on his own interests, which happen to be some stories of the prophets. Therefore four editorial citations from Ibn Ishāq in reference to two prophets can hardly be used to suggest, let alone to prove, Ibn Ishāq's original authorship of the *Akhhbār*.

Other characteristics of style that would seem to dissociate both Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hishām from the *Akhhbār* are the dialogue method peculiar to the *Akhhbār* and the fact that the *Akhhbār* has a greater proportion of poetry than either the *Sirah* or the *Tijān*. These factors reflect the general level and popularity of the predominantly secular phases of Arab learning in the age of transition from pre-Islāmic to Islāmic culture. Poetry, proverbs, and information of all sorts, but especially the genealogies and battle days of the Arabs, were transmitted in the age of Muḥammad himself generally by word of mouth in personal conversations or at small gatherings, except at the annual fairs, where the poets in particular could count on large audiences. It is well known, apart from the evidence of *Akhhbār 'Ubaid*, that there was no break in these interests and practices in the days of Ibn 'Abbās and Mu'āwiyah. These literary interests continued to be cultivated in much the same fashion as before and side by side with the new interests in the life and campaigns of Muḥammad and in the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth*, which new interests were increasingly occupying the minds of a younger generation of Muslims.

Again, Mu'āwiyah's real interest in the poetry, genealogy, and history (*ash'ār*, *ansāb*, and *akhhbār*) of the Arabs is well attested from sources, early and late, apart from the extant version of *Akhhbār 'Ubaid* and any other reference to Mu'āwiyah's interest in and association with 'Ubaid. Jāḥiẓ bears witness to Mu'āwiyah's lively interest in poetry.¹ His contemporary Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/860), himself a genealogist and historian, bears witness to Mu'āwiyah's interest in genealogy by reporting the latter's employment of Daghfal the genealogist as tutor to his son and heir Yazīd.² Ibn Qutaibah³ and Nadīm,⁴ among others, confirm Mu'āwiyah's association with Daghfal, whose knowledge of genealogy became proverbial and whose "genealogical treeing," *tashjīr*,⁵ called for written presentation of his vast materials. Extracts from his *Kitāb al-taẓāfur wa-al-tanāṣur*, which is described as the record of his sessions with Mu'āwiyah, have survived in later works.⁶ However, the author who has preserved the best summary of Mu'āwiyah's intellectual outlook and activities is Yāqūt, who reports him as saying: "It is not fitting for a man, particularly for a Quraishite, to dig deeply into any phase of knowledge except the science of history (*'ilm al-akhhbār*); as for the rest (of the sciences, he should acquire of each) little yet precious scatterings."⁷ The word *akhhbār* here must be interpreted in a wide sense to cover literary and artistic forms of history with its handmaidens poetry, genealogy, and biography, even as Yāqūt so interpreted it in the introduction to his *Irshād* or *Dictionary*, itself rich in poetry, genealogy, and historical biography. Mu'āwiyah, quite in keeping with his own conviction, took "a little" even of *ḥadīth*. His most precious tradition was "Allāh endows with religious understanding him for whom He wishes the best."⁸ The "rest of the sciences" existing in Mu'āwiyah's day to which he no doubt refers are those in which 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās was said to have excelled

¹ *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) p. 93.

² Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, ed. Ilse Lichtenstädter (Ḥaidarābād, 1942) p. 478; cf. *Fihrist*, pp. 106 f.; *Irshād* VI 474-78. For other bibliographic references to Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb see *GAL* I 106 and *GAL* S I 165 f.

³ *Ma'ārif*, p. 265.

⁴ *Fihrist*, p. 89.

⁵ *Ibid.* Both 'Ubaid and Daghfal are cited by Hamdānī among his chief sources for the *Iklīl* (see n. 11 on pp. 10 f. above). Rosenthal, who concedes (*History of Muslim Historiography*, p. 137) "the essentially historical character" of Hamdānī's *Iklīl*, has completely overlooked Hamdānī's acknowledged debt to both 'Ubaid and Daghfal, as he has overlooked Nadīm's reference to the *tashjīr*

of Daghfal. Though Rosenthal believes that tabular presentation of genealogical materials "probably was known to literate Arabs in pre-Islamic times," he states that "it would be idle to attempt to establish its earliest occurrence in Muslim literature" and adds that it is "highly unlikely" that even the *Kitāb al-mushajjār* of so late a genealogist as Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb contained genealogical trees (*ibid.* p. 86).

⁶ See *GAL* S I 101 and n. 5 above.

⁷ *Irshād* I 29 f.

⁸ Cf. e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 91-102, 250 f., 254 f. This tradition as transmitted by Mu'āwiyah is repeated no less than 15 times through 8 different channels. See also Bukhārī I 29.

—judging by the standards of the time—and to each of which the latter devoted a special session, namely jurisprudence, Qur'ānic interpretation, the campaigns of Muḥammad, poetry and the battle days of the Arabs (*fiqh*, *ta'wīl*, *maghāzī*, *shī'r*, *wa-ayyām al-'Arab*).¹ It is to be noted that though *ḥadīth* is not specifically mentioned in the list it, nevertheless, formed the basis of *fiqh* and *ta'wīl* and to a lesser extent of *maghāzī* also.

When the above-stated facts are taken into consideration together with the equally well known facts of Mu'āwiyah's proficiency as scribe and secretary of Muḥammad and his appreciation, as administrator and ruler, of written records, there appears to be nothing fanciful or improbable in either the stated occasion for the origin of *Akhbār 'Ubaid* or its initially oral and conversational method, or the predominance of poetry in it, or its final preservation in written form. It is, therefore, not at all surprising to find, on close reading of the tiresome *Akhbār*, that Mu'āwiyah now confirms, now challenges, 'Ubaid,² nor yet that he expresses wonder at the supposed events and admiration for their narrator.³ Nor is it surprising to discover that it is indeed Mu'āwiyah himself who time and again interrupts 'Ubaid's narration in order to demand poetry in confirmation of the events narrated.⁴ These frequent interruptions so irk 'Ubaid at times that he politely suggests that it would be best to leave the poetry to the end of each event or episode.⁵ Mu'āwiyah sees the point and accepts the suggestion, but the habit of demanding poetry as proof of historical events has him in its grip and he reverts again to demand poetry in the course of each episode or story.⁶ What is even more interesting in connection with the use of poetry as a source of history is his effort to justify it on the authority of Muḥammad.⁷ Here indeed we have, in both theory and practice, the origin and explanation of the excessive use of poetry in the early and still primitive Islāmic historiography. Instead of seeking to explain the great amount of poetry in the *Akhbār* by attributing the work to Ibn Ishāq, as Krenkow would have us do, is it not far more logical in the light of the above-stated facts to explain Ibn Ishāq's use of so much poetry in the *Sirah* as a reflection of this primitive and slowly yielding practice of the close association of poetry and history (*ash'ār wa-akhbār*)? Certainly the most outstanding historians and traditionists of the entire pre-'Abbāsīd period had a reputation for being students of poetry, and 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, who practiced both callings, used poetry in his *Maghāzī*.⁸ Jāḥiẓ in his essay on the qualities of the Turks emphasizes the Arabs' racial pride not only in their remarkable memories but in the fact that they "chained down memorable events with poetry",⁹ which certainly ought to be more applicable to the Arabs of Mu'āwiyah's day than to those of Jāḥiẓ' day. By the time of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf first-hand historical poetry was recognized as a class by itself and called *al-shāhid*, "the witness",¹⁰ and was therefore quoted as acceptable proof of the events concerned.

The dissociation of both Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hishām from the *Akhbār* leaves that work with the first-century 'Ubaid as author and the third-century Barqī as editor, with no *isnād* links to bridge the gap and indicate the means of transmission. This gap in itself certainly looks suspicious and suggests more than anything else stated so far the possibility of forgery. But, on second thought, to accept forgery creates more problems than it solves. What could a forger hope to gain, for either himself or his work, by failing to mention at least one full *isnād*, even though forged, that would take him back to the supposed author? Why should such a prolific forger, posing only as editor, be at the same time so restrained in editorial comments, for which he could take direct credit? How could such an inept and simple forger manage to keep from betraying himself through some provable anachronisms or inadvertent use of the literary style and the scribal conventions of his own day, such for instance as

¹ Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 122.

² *Akhbār*, pp. 331, 352, 406, 419, 436.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 323, 413, 430.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 316 f., 318, 326-30.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 335; see also p. 413 for 'Ubaid's gentle refusal to be interrupted.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 337, 352, 408, 434

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 326, 352, 434.

⁸ Cf. Horovitz, "The earliest biographies of the Prophet and their authors," *Islamic Culture* I (1927) 551, and see below (pp. 16 f.).

⁹ *Thalath rasā'il (Tria opuscula)*, ed. G. van Vloten (Lugduni Batavorum, 1903) pp. 12, 45 (= *Majmū' al-rasā'il* [Cairo, 1324] pp. 12, 43).

¹⁰ Mas'ūdī V 214. Mas'ūdī followed this usage (*Tanbih*, p. 76).

the more standardized use in the text of the various formulas of blessing on Muḥammad, the rest of the prophets, and the first four caliphs?¹

As no convincing arguments in favor of forgery are available, it is best to start once more with 'Ubaid and one of the Barqī brothers as author and editor respectively and seek some other way to explain the absence of an *isnād* to link them together. We return at this point to Asad ibn Mūsā (see p. 12), the great-grandson of the Umayyad Caliph Walīd I. He is known to have been a versatile scholar, traditionist, and historian who composed books, one of which, the *Kitāb al-zuhd*, has survived to our day.² He therefore would have had more than one good reason to be acquainted with the story of Mu'āwiyah and 'Ubaid and to acquire a copy of the original or of the current version of the *Akhhbār* of 'Ubaid. Asad settled in Egypt and was teacher of both Ibn Hishām and Muḥammad al-Barqī (d. 249/863). The latter's home became known as a house of learning, while his own varied works included history.³ Could it be that Asad had a copy of the *Akhhbār* which passed into the hands of Muḥammad al-Barqī after Asad's death, without an oral transmission? Under such circumstances a cautious third-century editor-transmitter of written texts, short of seeing himself in the role of mere copyist, would do precisely what the Barqī of the printed text of the *Akhhbār* actually did, that is: give no full *isnād* simply because there was none to give; give the shortest *isnād* possible, namely, one in which the first and the last link are used to indicate the author and the editor-transmitter respectively; use the loose and indefinite technical term '*an*', which allows for indirect transmission, and the unspecified *raf'*, which together with '*an*' or '*an'anah*' indicates omission of links in the *isnād*;⁴ make no pretensions to any oral transmission; and take care to use the term *dhakara* instead of *qāla* in his editorial citations to indicate that they too, like the main text, were from written sources only.

The above digression has served to question the very basis of Krenkow's allegations against the historicity of 'Ubaid and his attribution of the *Akhhbār* to Ibn Ishāq. By exploring the other side of the case, particularly the methodology of the *Akhhbār* and of the *Tijān*, we restore a measure of confidence in the numerous literary references, critical or otherwise, to 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah and his work. Islāmic historians, early or late, have never questioned the historicity of the man or his original authorship of the *Akhhbār*. The circumstances of initial composition, the varied channels of oral and written transmission, and the legendary folkloristic nature of the work no doubt invited many interpolations and additions. Transmitter-editor notes, which in a manuscript age easily slide into the main text by the hand of a hurried or careless scribe, have certainly contributed their share of these.⁵

Several other Umayyads, caliphs or not, took personal interest in poetry, history, and Tradition. The interest of the forceful and successful 'Abd al-Malik in *ḥadīth* and *fiqh* dated back to the years before his caliphate (65–86/685–705), when, like Mu'āwiyah, he too memorized and transmitted a few traditions.⁶ His interests expanded to include dogma and history, as evidenced by the information he and his major-domo, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, sought from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and by his patronage of the traditionist-historians 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair and Zuhri. Ḥajjāj's correspondence with Ḥasan resulted in the latter's famous document *Risālah fi al-qadr*,⁷ while some of 'Urwah's letters in response to 'Abd

¹ Abraham and Hūd, in this order, seem to be more favored in this respect than others (see e.g. *Akhhbār*, pp. 314 f., 324–26, 331, 333). The blessing on Muḥammad is sometimes invoked, in either its shorter or its longer form, and sometimes omitted (see *ibid.* pp. 314, 352, 406).

² Cf. Ḥajjī Khalīfah V 91; Wilhelm Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin II* (Berlin, 1889) 247, No. 1552. Ahlwardt has mistaken Asad's birth date for his death date (see n. 3 on p. 12 above).

³ See Ibn Farḥūn, *Al-dibāj al-mudhḥab* (Cairo, 1351) pp. 233 f.; Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-muḥāḍarah* (Cairo, 1299) I 197. See also p. 63 below.

⁴ For the use of these terms in regular *ḥadīth* trans-

mission see e.g. Alfred Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 86 f., 181 f.

⁵ Rosenthal holds much the same view on 'Ubaid as does Krenkow, whom, however, he does not cite; nor does he give any specific reason for his own extreme skepticism concerning the relationship of 'Ubaid and Mu'āwiyah; see his *History of Muslim Historiography*, pp. 44 f., 52, 56; also pp. 61 f., 81, 165, 265, where 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, Wahb ibn Munabbih, and 'Āmir al-Sha'bī fare just a shade better than does 'Ubaid.

⁶ Ibn Sa'd V 167, 174.

⁷ See Hellmut Ritter, "Studien zur Geschichte der islamischen Frömmigkeit", *Der Islam* XXI (1933) 1–83, esp. pp. 67–83; Julian Obermann, "Political theory in

al-Malik's requests have been preserved in Ṭabarī. The latter give ample evidence that 'Urwah collected materials on the Meccan¹ as well as on the Medinan² period of the life of Muḥammad, including the *maghāzī*. He passed these materials to his son Hishām and instructed him to collate his written copies with the original texts.³ It is true that 'Urwah burned some of his *fiqh* books in the disturbing times of the Battle of Ḥarraḥ (63/683) in the civil war between 'Abd al-Malik and 'Urwah's brother, and counter-caliph, 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair. But 'Urwah lived to regret his action and to wish that he had his early written materials on hand.⁴ His famous pupil Zuhri not only wrote the *Maghāzī* on his own initiative but also wrote down Tradition, tribal history, and biography upon the order of the Umayyads, beginning with the period of his service as tutor to the sons of 'Abd al-Malik.⁵ The princes, like their second famous tutor, 'Āmir al-Sha'bi,⁶ had access to *maghāzī* books. 'Abd al-Malik once took such books from their hands and destroyed them, directing their attention instead to the Qur'ān and the *sunnaḥ*, which obviously had priority in the princes' curriculum.⁷

Like Mu'āwiyah, 'Abd al-Malik paralleled his interest in history with that in poetry. He instructed Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf to seek out for him a scholar versed in the history and poetry of the Arabs. Ḥajjāj's choice was the scholar-traditionist Sha'bi, who, in addition to tutoring the princes, informed and entertained 'Abd al-Malik in much the same way that 'Ubaid had informed and entertained Mu'āwiyah earlier.⁸ Sha'bi's contemporaries, older and younger, provide further illustration of parallel interest and proficiency in poetry, history, and Tradition. 'Urwah, for instance, was well versed in poetry, and Zuhri usually followed a session of *ḥadīth* with one of poetry.⁹ 'Abd al-Malik's brother Bishr ibn Marwān (d. 73 or 74/692 or 693), governor of Kūfah and Baṣrah, had also established the reputation of being learned in history, poetry, and genealogy.¹⁰ 'Abd al-Malik's son Walid I (86–96/705–15), who

early Islam." *JAOS* LV (1935) 138–62. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is credited with two other works, *Mawā'iz* and *Masā'il*, which were in circulation in the time of Jāḥiẓ (see Louis Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane* [Paris, 1954] pp. 177 f.). Ḥusain ibn Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj claimed to be quoting the *Kitāb al-ikhhlās*, a section of the *Masā'il*, at the time of his trial in 309/922; but the judge, who had also "heard" the *Ikhhlās* read out, accused Ḥallāj of false quotations (see *Eclipse* I 80 and Massignon, *op. cit.* p. 178).

¹ E.g. Ṭabarī I 1180 f., 1224, 1234, 1770; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* I 542–45; W. Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad at Mecca* (Oxford, 1953) pp. xii, 40, 100 f., 106 f., 145 f., 180–82.

² Ṭabarī I 1284–88, 1634–36, 1654, 1670; Ḥajjāj Khalīfah V 647.

³ Fück, *Muḥammad ibn Ishāq*, p. 8; Horovitz, "The earliest biographies of the Prophet and their authors," *Islamic Culture* II 170; H. A. R. Gibb in *EI* Supplement, p. 234; Rosenthal, *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship* ("Analecta orientalia" XXIV [Roma, 1947]) p. 14.

⁴ Ibn Sa'd V 133; August Fischer, *Biographien von Gewährsmännern des Ibn Ishāq* (Leiden, 1890) pp. 41, 47; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* I 547 f. 'Urwah was not alone in regretting the destruction of written materials.

⁵ Goldziher, *Studien* II 38 f.; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 46–50. Zuhri's role as a traditionist who committed his materials to writing will be fully treated in Vol. II of this series in connection with the *ḥadīth* papyri.

⁶ E.g. Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, p. 475; *Irshād* I 30; Khatīb XII 230. It should be noted that both Muir and Sprenger accepted this early

maghāzī literature, though they took opposite sides in the famous Muḥammadan Controversy (see below, p. 26, n. 1).

⁷ See Goldziher, *Studien* II 206; Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs* (2d ed.) p. 247. The order of subject priority in early education is reflected in Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥaya-wān* (Cairo, 1938) I 93, as Qur'ān, *athār*, *khābar*. It is possible, however, that the *maghāzī* books which were destroyed were some storyteller's version reflecting more zeal and imagination than sober facts.

⁸ See references cited in n. 6. Sha'bi's reputation and scholarly functions at the court of 'Abd al-Malik are curiously reflected in a late work falsely attributed to Aṣmā'i, *Nihāyat al-arab fī akhbār al-Furs wa-al-'Arab*, which claims to be an introductory supplement to an earlier work composed at the request of 'Abd al-Malik in 85/704 by Sha'bi and Ibn al-Qirriyah aided by Ibn al-Muqaffa'. Jawād 'Alī has pointed out the chronological contradictions involved in this claim (see his "Mawārid ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī," *Majallah* II [1951] 142–48). Cf. *GAL* S I 164 and Rosenthal, *History of Muslim Historiography*, pp. 52, 165, and references there cited. It should be noted, however, that Ḥajjāj frequently sought historical information from scholars and scribes; cf. Ibn al-Faqīh, *Kitāb al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (*BGA* V [1885]) pp. 2, 92, 114, 209.

⁹ See above (p. 15) and cf. Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* I 551 f. and II 50.

¹⁰ Cf. Jāḥiẓ, *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) p. 97; Ṭabarī II 816, 852. Most of the Umayyads, but especially Hishām, had poetical talent, and their poetry was collected by a contemporary of Ja'far ibn Sulaimān (d. 198/814); cf. Ṭabarī II 1732; Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 44.

with the aid of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf continued his father's imperial policies, followed the latter's example in intellectual matters as well.¹ It was Walid I who appointed one of the earliest known professional calligraphers, Khālīd ibn al-Haiyāj, to write down for him copies of the Qur'ān as well as poetry and history (*al-maṣāḥif wa-al-ash'ār wa-al-akhbār*).²

It is interesting to note that at the same time that 'Abd al-Malik, Walid I, and Ḥajjāj were actively concerned in these scholarly matters 'Abd al-Malik's brother 'Abd al-Azīz (d. 85/704), governor of Egypt, and his son 'Umar were beginning to take a special interest in Tradition. 'Urwah's presence in Egypt (58–65/677–84)³ had perhaps some direct influence on them. 'Abd al-Azīz is said to have commissioned the written collection of the traditions transmitted by those who had fallen at the Battle of Badr, except the traditions of Abū Hurairah (d. 58/678), which he already had in writing.⁴ Such a collection, even if incomplete, must have formed a sizable book, to judge by the *musnad*'s of these men as preserved in Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ḥanbal, even allowing for later accretions and fabrications. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Azīz is said to have been a serious-minded student of Tradition, law, and history (*ḥadīth*, *fiqh*, and *athār*) even before his caliphate.⁵ The statement that he commissioned the writing-down of the entire body of Tradition has been questioned as a partisan attempt to add to the stature of the pious 'Umar.⁶ But 'Umar's sustained interest in these matters was too well known to friend and foe alike and too willingly conceded to call for any such attempts. The commission was in all probability given and work on it begun, but the untimely death of 'Umar caused the work to be shelved. 'Umar's patronage of leading traditionists and historians for the transmission of *maghāzī* and *siyar* seems to have suffered more or less the same fate so far as his own reign was involved, though some of the scholars concerned, including Zuhri, wrote in these fields later.⁷

The Caliph Hishām's interest in history is well attested by the translation of Persian historical works for him by Ibn al-Muqaffa' in 113/723. The translator's conviction that history is one of man's main concerns⁸ must have been shared by his patron. Hishām's parallel interest in poetry was also well known.⁹ Prince Maslamah's archeological interests in Alexander and his campaigns are part of the same picture (see our Document 2). Finally, Walid II (125–26/743–44), as prince and as caliph, patronized poets and scholars. According to Tha'lab (200–291/815–904), he collected the records of the Arabs—their poetry, history, genealogy, and dialects—which records later reached the hands of Ḥammād al-Rāwīyah (ca. 75–156/694–773) and his fellow student of poetry Jannād.¹⁰

If it is argued that in some of these instances *akhbār* meant not history proper but only historical and biographical commentaries largely on poetry and poets, the argument can be countered by the recognition that poetry itself was the main vehicle of Arab history in the pre-Islāmic and early Islāmic periods, when exclusive specialization in any one of the fields of poetry, genealogy, Tradition, and history was yet to come or just barely beginning.¹¹ Certainly there existed a vast area of overlap, not

¹ *Sīrah*, p. 754; Wellhausen, p. 263; Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, p. 477; see also Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* I 545 f.

² *Fihrist*, p. 9.

³ Cf. Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* I 543 f.

⁴ Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 157.

⁵ See Ibn Sa'd V 284; Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, p. 477; Jāḥiẓ, *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) p. 98; Ṭabarī II 1183; Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* I 546.

⁶ Ibn Sa'd I 2, pp. 179 f., 182; Bukhārī I 37; Dārimī, *Sunan* (Damascus, 1349) I 126; cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 34, 210 f.; Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* II 24 f., 27; Mackensen in *AJS* LII 248 and references there cited; see also Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford, 1950) pp. 62, 64.

⁷ Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 134; cf. Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* II 22–50, esp. pp. 24, 31–33, 47, for details and

sources; cf. also Jawād 'Alī in *Majallah* I 198.

⁸ *Irshād* I 29.

⁹ See above (p. 17, n. 10) for references to an early collection of poetry of the Umayyad caliphs.

¹⁰ *Fihrist*, p. 91, quoting Tha'lab. References to pre-Islāmic written collections of poetry will be discussed in a subsequent volume of this series in connection with the papyrus poetry fragments on hand.

¹¹ Some degree of specialization in these fields, as in the primarily linguistic and religious sciences, was current by the end of the 1st century, when the still youthful Abū Ḥanīfah (80–150 or 151/699–767 or 768) weighed the merits of each science and decided to specialize in *fiqh* (Khaṭīb XIII 331 f.). Some half a century later exclusive specialization in each of these fields reached such a high level that the leading Baṣran scholars refused to commit themselves on any point not in their field of specialization. This was in contrast to

only in the subject matter of these fields but also in the personnel of leading scholars, almost throughout the Umayyad period, where history is linked on the one hand to poetry as seen in *Akhbār 'Uбайд* and on the other hand to Tradition as seen in the activities of 'Urwah and Zuhri and culminating in the historical works of Ibn Ishāq, in which *khbar*, *shi'r*, and *ḥadīth*, not to mention *ansāb*, go hand in hand (see pp. 14 f.). The cultural level of the period under consideration does not permit the strict limitation of *khbar* to any one of the fields; for it is a period more of common origins than of particular specialization such as is to develop presently. It is a period nevertheless of rapidly expanding historical consciousness, in which all available historical information (*akhbār*) forms a common pool of source materials to be drawn on by the emerging literary scholar, genealogist, traditionist, and historian, each according to his need and interest. It is a formative period in which political, religious, and literary history still have much in common though each is becoming increasingly recognizable with an identity of its own within the group.

The bringing together of the above numerous references to the Umayyads' interest in and furtherance of the intellectual life of their times makes readily apparent the fact that Muslim scholars and historians writing at different times and in different settings have contributed their bits of information without any one of them attempting to fit the facts to the character of caliph or prince. The historically-minded Mu'āwiyah, the hardheaded 'Abd al-Malik and his governor brothers Bishr and 'Abd al-Azīz, the pious 'Umar II, the merchant Caliph Hishām, the sacrilegious Walīd II, and the soldier-prince Maslamah, one and all, receive only incidental mention of their interest or patronage, and no attempt is made to create a pro-Umayyad picture as such. That such a picture does nevertheless emerge and, furthermore, that its details are supplied by scholars of the comparatively early 'Abbāsīd period, when the Umayyads generally were *personae non gratae*, are in themselves highly significant facts. The one early author who takes a comprehensive view of Umayyad intellectual achievements as such is the violently anti-Umayyad¹ and pro-'Abbāsīd Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/869). Nevertheless, even he in his polemics gives credit where credit is due. His *Faḍl Hāshim 'alā 'Abd al-Shams* comes out categorically for the superiority of the 'Abbāsīds over the Umayyads without, however, denying the sizable achievements of the latter despite Jāḥiẓ' refutation of most of what he considers to be exaggerated Umayyad claims. Jāḥiẓ' recognition is, furthermore, a tacit one since it is limited to such Umayyad claims as he makes no attempt to refute.² The unrefuted claims include those in the references to Mu'āwiyah, Bishr, and 'Umar II already cited above.³ Again, despite Jāḥiẓ' blanket statement that the Umayyads had not one who excelled in jurisprudence, Tradition, and Qur'ānic commentary and interpretation (*al-fiqh wa-al-'ilm wa-al-tafsīr wa-al-ta'wīl*), he does nevertheless recognize 'Umar II's interest in these fields in an oblique passage that accuses 'Umar of "writing books" on free will in the manner of the Jahmīyah sect.⁴ It should be noticed further that Jāḥiẓ allowed to stand unchallenged his own presentation of the Umayyad claim that Khālīd ibn Yazīd (d. between 85 and 90/704 and 708) was "an orator and a poet, rich in culture, and a man of wisdom, the first to patronize the translators and the philosophers. He gathered around him men of wisdom and the leading experts in all the arts. He (had) translated (for him) books of astronomy, medicine, chemistry, war, literature, instruments, and the arts."⁵ Some of

the exceptionally gifted Kūfan scholar and tutor of Hārūn al-Rashīd, Kisā'i (ca. 119-89/737-805), whose enthusiastic admirers claimed that he was expert in all fields (*ibid.* Vol. XI 407).

¹ Jāḥiẓ, *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) pp. 292-300.

² *Ibid.* pp. 70 and 93-103 cover mostly Umayyad claims; pp. 103-16 give refutations of these with counterclaims on behalf of the 'Abbāsīds.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 93, 97, 98.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 90, 106; this early sect was named after its founder, Jahm ibn Ṣafwān (d. 128/745).

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 93. The word *ṣinā'āt*, translated "arts"

above, covers both the trades and the professions; see Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-bayān wa-al-tabyīn* (Cairo, 1947) I 314; cf. *Ma'ārīf*, p. 179; *Fihrist*, pp. 242, 244, 353 f. It is to be noted that Jāḥiẓ does not equate translation with original composition. In his masterly analysis of the qualifications and tribulations of the best of translators, he drives this point home by referring to Khālīd, among other early translators, as not to be compared in merit to the original authors; see *Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) I 76, from which it would seem that Jāḥiẓ believed that Khālīd himself did at least some of the translations.

INTRODUCTION

these translations, no matter how unpretentious, along with a collection of Arabic and Islāmic manuscripts, must have formed the nucleus of Khālid's library.¹ It is entirely possible, Ibn Khaldūn's adverse position on Khālid notwithstanding (see p. 27), that the Umayyads individually and as a group deserve even more credit than that so grudgingly conceded them by Jāḥiẓ. However, what concerns us at this point is not so much the achievement of the Umayyads as individuals or as a group but rather the over-all cultural achievement of the Umayyad period as a whole. Here again it is Jāḥiẓ who, in summing up the cultural achievements of both the 'Alid and the 'Abbāsīd branches of the Hāshimītes, before and after the coming of the 'Abbāsīds to political power, gives a balanced view of the rapidly developing trends in both the religious and the secular intellectual activities of the time.² Nor is the picture complete without a consideration of the initiative and contribution of the non-Quraishite tribes and of the aggressive heterodox sects of the Khārījites. There is, for instance, the Khārījite Ṣabīgh ibn 'Isl, whose books were among those destroyed by 'Umar I.³

Had the numerous historical works dating from the Umayyad and early 'Abbāsīd periods—many of which were specifically concerned with the history and biography of the Umayyads—survived, we today would have our task much simplified. But the very fact that so many historical works are known to have been composed at that time⁴ is itself indicative of a rapidly growing historical literature, be it strictly factual, semilegendary, or largely fictional. For neither the historical legend nor the historical novel can come into being and flourish without widespread historical consciousness and genuine and sustained interest in history and biography no matter how primitive as yet in literary form.⁵ Nor should one seek to force on the comparatively primitive first-century Islāmic historians the hard and fast distinction between history proper in its modern concept and the legendary and semilegendary history, both religious and secular, predominantly current in their day not only among themselves but among their Christian and Jewish neighbors as well. Such a distinction cannot be made without distorting the historical picture. For with the Qur'ān as a historical document for a starter, in much the same way as the Sacred Scriptures of Jews, Christians, and Magians were considered historical, the earliest Arab historians were interested as much in religious historical legends as in such contemporary and factual history as they could base on *ḥadīth* and *khavar* together with the results of their own experience and observation. The earliest histories had perforce to deal with historical legends and with the lives and campaigns of Muḥammad and the leading Companions. Such circumstances, in the background of accelerated national consciousness and power, were bound to produce an 'Ubaid, a Wahb, and an 'Urwah for the pagan, Biblical-Qur'ānic, and secular Islāmic phases of first-century Islāmic historiography. Without the initial steps taken by these men and several of their less known contemporaries in both oral and written transmission, the remarkable literary activities and tangible written achievements of such second-century historians as Zuhri and his pupil Ibn Ishāq, the senior Kalbī and his son Hishām, Wāqidī and his scribes and copyists would have been impossible (see pp. 9, 24–26).

Third-century Islāmic historians, writing under the shadow of the 'Abbāsīds and rightly impressed

¹ See *EI* IV 1045, under "Kitābkhāna"; see Mackensen in *AJS* LIV (1937) 52–56 for the controversy over Khālid's achievements.

² *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) pp. 70–93, 103–16; cf. Khaṭīb I 175, 186 f.

³ Ibn 'Asākir VI 384 f.; *Mizān* II 276; Goldziher, *Studien* II 131; Fück in *ZDMG* XCIII 9. See Sahīr al-Qalamāwī, *Adab al-Khawārij* (Cairo, 1945) esp. pp. 75–77, for the poet and traditionist 'Imrān ibn Ḥaṭṭān.

⁴ Cf. *Fihrist*, pp. 89–115, esp. pp. 89, 90, 91, 92, 101 f., 109; Mas'ūdī I 12; *GAL* S I 203–31. Some of the earliest pro-Umayyad literature must have survived for a considerable time among the clients of that

dynasty, since the descendants of those clients had access to a work of some 300 leaves entitled *Proofs of the Umayyad Imāmate*, which discussed the Syrian and the Spanish Umayyads to the year 310/922. Mas'ūdī saw and used the work, which he describes, in 324/936 (cf. *Tanbih*, pp. 336 f.). Muqaddasī, writing in 375/985, reports the existence of an extremist pro-Mu'āwiyah faction in Baghdād; cf. his *Aḥsān al-taqāsīm*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (*BGA* III [2d ed.; 1906]) p. 126.

⁵ Rosenthal, *History of Muslim Historiography*, pp. 164–66, overemphasizes the role of the novel and underestimates that of historical works of the first centuries of Islām—a reflection, no doubt, of his generally skeptical outlook on Islām's earliest historians.

by the magnificent achievements of the period from Manṣūr to Ma'mūn, set the pattern for the treatment of cultural history by giving little or no reference to the extent of the cultural foundations laid in the Umayyad period. The pattern is still hard to shake off even today.¹ Western translators, themselves caught in this trend, sometimes have aided and abetted the Muslim historians in neglect of the period if not indeed in robbing it of due credit. This is nowhere better illustrated than in the famous passage of Mas'ūdī describing the cultural achievements of Manṣūr and his reign. Barbier de Meynard's translation of the passage relating to the religious sciences overemphasizes Manṣūr's personal achievements in these branches at the expense of giving credit to the variety, extent, and advanced level of the materials, oral and written, that Manṣūr found ready to hand. These cultural materials and activities included a body of religious knowledge which Manṣūr scrutinized, legal systems in which he became well read, varied opinions with which he familiarized himself, religious sects which he investigated, and books of Tradition which he examined (cf. pp. 24 f.).² Without a sizable cultural heritage Manṣūr could not have engaged in any one of these intellectual activities. For, as is readily to be seen, each activity demands the prior existence of a pertinent body of knowledge. In other words, Manṣūr's intellectual activities were primarily acquisitive and critical rather than originative. Much of the grist for the intellectual mills of his reign, particularly in these essentially Islāmic disciplines, was provided by a previous generation of scholars. Here, then, as in the case of history and historians (see pp. 88–90), what Manṣūr did was not so much to initiate patronage of traditionists and historians as to consolidate the cultural results of the Umayyad period irrespective of tribal claims and carry on from there to the greater and higher achievements of his reign through his patronage of scholarly leaders in each field. It is Ibn Ṣā'id, the Spanish Muslim historian of comparative cultures, who, writing in the eleventh century and free from pro-'Abbāsīd bias, does adequate justice to both Khālīd and Manṣūr and their times without losing sight of the progressive element in a continuously evolving culture (see p. 27). He stresses the early Muslim Arabs' preoccupation with linguistic, religious, and medical sciences in general and Khālīd's gifts in particular, at the same time that he recognizes the rapid progress made in these and other sciences in the reign of Manṣūr, who was especially interested in law and philosophy and above all in astronomy and who therefore patronized scholars in these fields.³

The failure or reluctance of some scholars, Muslim or Western, to give at least the benefit of a doubt to such facts of Umayyad cultural history as have survived to our day, particularly in respect to written records and literature, still remains to be explained. Two factors have contributed to this reluctance—the one objective and specific, the other subjective and generalized. The first consists of misunderstanding and misuse of such basic words as the verbs *jama'*, *rawā*, *dhakar*, and some of their derivatives, as also of the nouns *ṣaḥīfah*, *daftar*, and *dīwān*. The verb *jama'*, “to collect,” has been too generally accepted as a synonym of *ḥafaẓ*, “to memorize.” As a matter of fact, the verb *jama'* was and still is used to indicate both memorizing and writing down one's collections. Sometimes it was quite specifically stated which of these two meanings was intended, *jama' fi al-ḥāfiẓah* or *jama' fi al-maṣḥaf*.⁴ But frequently it was left for the reader to deduce from the context which meaning was intended. A case in point is the above-mentioned (p. 18) collection of Arab records made by Walīd II, *jama' dīwān al-'Arab*. Again, it is because the verb *jama'* did actually mean “to write down a collection” that the nouns derived from it, *jāmi'*, *majmū'*, *majmū'ah*, and the plural *majmū'āt*, came early to mean “written collection(s),” as a glance at these terms in Brockelmann's Index to his great *GAL* Supplement readily reveals.⁵ The first *jāmi'*, in this sense, was the Qur'ān. The above-listed words were loosely used for

¹ Cf. e.g. Jawād 'Alī in *Majallah* I 174, 185.

² Mas'ūdī VIII 292. For the pitfalls of manuscript editors and translators cf. Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) I 75–79.

³ Ibn Ṣā'id, *Kitāb ṭabaqāt al-umam*, ed. Louis Cheikho (Beyrouth, 1912) pp. 47 f., and trans. Régis Blachère (Paris, 1935) pp. 98 f.

⁴ See Sālimī, *Ḥāshiyat al-jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ, musnad al-Rabī 'ibn Ḥabīb* (Cairo, 1326) I 20, 45, 48; Ibn Abī Dā'ūd, *Kitāb al-maṣāḥif*, ed. Arthur Jeffery (Leiden, 1937) pp. 5–26; Jāḥiẓ, *Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1933) pp. 119–20.

⁵ Cf. also Goldziher, *Studien* II 194–203, 231.

INTRODUCTION

one's own collections of this and that in the first century. But by the early second century and increasingly thereafter they appear in the titles of books, at first largely in *fiqh* and *ḥadīth* literature and presently in most fields of intellectual endeavor.¹

Again, *rawā* and *riwāyah* have been limited too generally to mean oral transmission though it has long been recognized that even some of the earliest transmission of *ḥadīth* was aided by written notes in a *ṣaḥīfah* or *ṣuḥuf*. Unfortunately even this recognition served to obscure further the existence of book-size written collections, since *ṣaḥīfah* and *ṣuḥuf* have been taken to mean for the most part brief memorandum notes or small pamphlets used only as aids to memory. The fact is that this limited meaning held the field for only a very short time. It was certainly not the only meaning of the word *ṣaḥīfah* in the second half of the first century. For instance, Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl, who borrowed and copied the books of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, gives a very graphic description of a sizable *ṣaḥīfah* that contained the latter's *ʿilm*, by which is meant his collection of *ḥadīth*. He indicates that it was a roll as thick as a circle made by the joining of a man's thumbs and forefingers, that is, about six inches thick.² This was also the size of some of Zuhri's *ḥadīth* collections.³ Again, *ḥadīth* collections were sometimes, like the Qurʾān itself, in codex form. There is, for instance, the case of Khālīd ibn Maʾrān (d. 104/722) of Syria, whose *ʿilm* was contained in a codex placed between two boards that were drawn together by clasps.⁴

Attention has been drawn (p. 13; see also p. 53) to the verb *dhakara* as indicating materials drawn from written records and books used on their own authority. This usage is in contradistinction to that of the verbs *qāla*, *ḥadatha*, *akhhbara*, and *amlā ʿalā*, "to say," "to relate," "to inform," and "to dictate," where the emphasis is on oral transmission, even when the teacher or author dictated his materials, including *ḥadīth*, either from memory or from a written copy to his pupils, his fellow scholars, or professional copyists, who eagerly took down his dictation. Quite instructive is the case of the poet, traditionist, and general scholar Shaʿbī, who, though he prided himself on his great powers of memory, did nevertheless dictate his varied materials, some of which resulted in book-size manuscripts.⁵ It is he who is credited with the saying "the best traditionist is the *daftar*" and with urging his listeners to write down everything they heard from him, if only on the walls.⁶ Yazīd ibn Abī Muslim, secretary of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf and later governor of ʿIrāq and of North Africa, marveled at the quality and extent of Shaʿbī's ready knowledge and addressed the latter, who wrote no books, in terms freely translated as "a walking encyclopedia."⁷

Again, *daftar*, like *ṣaḥīfah*, has frequently suffered diminution in size, the word being translated in

¹ See e.g. *GAL* S I 255, 257, 300, 313 for titles from the 2d century. The *ḡāmiʿ fī al-ḥadīth* of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Wahb (125–97/743–812) has survived in a papyrus copy dated 276/889, which has been edited and published by Jean David-Weill, *Le Djāmiʿ dʿIbn Wahb* ("Publications de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale: Textes arabes" III [2 vols.; Le Caire, 1939–48]).

² Ibn Saʿd VII 1, pp. 116, 126; Sālimī, *Ḥāshiyat al-jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ, musnad al-Rabīʿ ibn Ḥabīb* I 42, 49. See Goldziher, *Studien* II 8–10, 195 f., for many other early instances of *ṣuḥuf* containing written traditions, some of which also must have been quite large. In the Heidelberg papyrus collection is a late 2d- or early 3d-century *ṣaḥīfah* roll, 189 cm. in length, containing traditions transmitted from ʿAbd Allāh ibn Lahīʾah (d. 174/790); see Carl H. Becker, *Papyri Schott-Reinhardt* I ("Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung" III [Heidelberg, 1906]) 9; cf. *GAL* S I 256.

³ Khaṭīb, *Kitāb al-kifāyah fī ʿilm al-riwāyah* (Ḥaidarābād, 1357) p. 329.

⁴ Ibn Abī Dāʾūd, *Kitāb al-maṣāḥif*, pp. 134 f.; Dhahabī I 87 f. Even poetry collections were sometimes

in excellent script and had luxurious bindings (see Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥayawān* [Cairo, 1938] I 61).

⁵ Ibn Saʿd VI 175; Khaṭīb XII 227, 232; cf. Dhahabī I 80. There are many other early instances, some of which will be discussed in Vol. II of this series in connection with papyri dealing with *ḥadīth* proper. See below (p. 24) for Ibn Ishāq's practice; this practice is not to be confused with the *munāwalah* proper, which was already current in his day and used at times by him, as when he wrote down 1000 *ḥadīth* for a contemporary (cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 189). For a graphic description of the role of the *warrāq* as publisher for Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrāʾ in 202/817 see Khaṭīb XIV 149 f. (cf. *GAL* S I 178 f.). The *warrāq*'s shop soon became the meeting place of the cultured (see *ʿIqd* II 223).

⁶ Ibn Saʿd VI 174; Thaʿālibī, *Al-ijāz wa-al-iʿjāz* (published in *Khams rasāʾil* [Constantinople, 1301]) p. 9; cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 199.

⁷ Abū Nuʾaim IV 325, 327; Ṭabarī II 1111 f., 1268, 1435. A literal translation of Yazīd's expression is, "By God, what knowledge there is between your two (book) boards!"

connection with literary manuscripts for the most part as "notebook" or "pamphlet."¹ Though the word did have this meaning when first taken over from Persian into Arabic, it was not limited to this meaning for long, but came to be used also for a book, *kitāb*, with which word it frequently alternates in historical and literary sources in reference to events of the first and second centuries of Islām. It is true that the word *kitāb* itself was used to mean anything written, from a letter or receipt to a notebook, pamphlet, or book, including *the Book* or Qur'ān. Here again the context frequently helps to determine the appropriate meanings of both terms, *kitāb* and *daftar*. When the plurals, *kutub* and *dafātir*, are used, especially in connection with the entire manuscript collection of a leading scholar, traditionist, or copyist, they cover a collection of manuscripts that includes notebooks, pamphlets, and book-size works not only of the author's own compositions in different stages of preparation but also documents and works of other authors acquired by gift, loan, purchase, and/or personal copying. There were, for instance, some documents of Muḥammad that reached the hands of Yazid ibn Ḥabīb in Egypt, who sent them to Zuhri.² The books of Ibn 'Abbās passed to his pupil Kuraib (d. 98/716), who gave them to Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah, who loaned them out for copying.³ The Kūfan Abū Qilābah (d. 104/233) left his books, among which were some original historical documents, to Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī.⁴ Manuscripts of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī were borrowed by Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl, who copied them before returning them to Ḥasan.⁵ Ḥakam ibn 'Utaibah (d. 114/732) gave his written collection of *ḥadīth* to a fellow traditionist.⁶ These are not to be considered as exceptions to the rule, for many other examples of such practices could be cited from the second half of the first century.⁷ There are frequent references such as the camel-load of *kutub* or *dafātir* of 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās,⁸ or the *dafātir* or *kutub* of historical works in Mu'āwiyah's library,⁹ or the sackfuls of books (*kutub*) that passed from Abū Qilābah to Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī, or the many loads of *dafātir* of Zuhri that were taken out of Walid II's library,¹⁰ or Ibn al-'Alā's (68–154/687–771) roomful of *dafātir* that reached to the ceiling,¹¹ or the several trunkfuls of books of Sufyān al-Thaurī (d. 161/777).¹² These collections, in the order mentioned, must have contained a progressively increasing ratio of fair-sized monographs and books over pamphlets and notes.¹³ Even though we assume that *daftar* was more apt to mean a notebook, there is no reason why several notebooks could not together constitute the manuscript of a sizable single work of a given author, such as was the case indeed with Shaibānī's (d. 189/804) *Kitāb al-siyar al-kabir*, which was copied in no less than sixty *dafātir* for Awzā'i (d. 157/773), who presented the complete work to Manṣūr, who in turn considered it one of the treasures of his library.¹⁴ It is to be noted also that *Kahilah wa-*

¹ In administrative and commercial documents the word generally meant a register or an account book (see p. 4).

² *Sīrah*, p. 972; Goldziher, *Studien* II 51; Fück in *ZDMG* XCIII 6 f.

³ Ibn Sa'd V 216; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 167.

⁴ Ibn Sa'd VII 1, pp. 91, 135, VII 2, p. 17.

⁵ Ibn Sa'd VII 1, p. 126, VII 2, p. 20.

⁶ Khaṭīb VII 348; Dhahabī I 110 f.

⁷ See e.g. Ibn Abī Dā'ūd, *Kitāb al-maṣāḥif*, pp. 134 f. Khaṭīb (*Kifāyah*, pp. 352 f.) discusses the pros and cons of the use of books without oral transmission. These and other examples will be discussed in Vol. II of this series in connection with *ḥadīth* papyri.

⁸ Ibn Sa'd V 216; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 167. See Tirmidhī XIII 326 for early circulation of Ibn 'Abbās' materials in writing. Muḥammad and his generation seem to have been familiar with animals carrying loads of books, to judge by figurative and proverbial references made by Muḥammad himself in *Sūrah* 62:5 and by 'Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān in one of his speeches while he was governor of Egypt (43–44/664–65); see Ibn al-Athīr, *Uṣd al-ghābah fī ma'rifat al-*

ṣaḥābah (Cairo, 1285–87) III 152.

⁹ See Mas'ūdī V 77 f. and above (p. 10). See below (p. 29) for the *dafātir* of another library of the first century.

¹⁰ Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 136; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 48.

¹¹ *Irshād* IV 217; Gurgīs 'Awwād, *Khazā'in al-kutub al-qadimah fī al-'Irāq* (Baghdād, 1948) p. 191. Nadīm saw some of Ibn al-'Alā's books (*Fihrist*, p. 41). There were others of Ibn al-'Alā's time who were interested in acquiring and reading *kutub* or *dafātir* (Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥayawān* [Cairo, 1938] I 60 f.).

¹² Ibn Sa'd VI, p. 259, VII 2, p. 72; *Fihrist*, p. 225; Khaṭīb IX 160 f.; Gurgīs 'Awwād, *Khazā'in*, pp. 191 f. Sufyān al-Thaurī's *Jāmi'* is lost (see *GAL* S I 255).

¹³ For titles and fates of some of the books of the authors concerned see *Fihrist*, pp. 40 f., 225–27; *GAL* S I 158, 255, 282, 308 f.

¹⁴ Ḥajjī Khalīfah IV 638; Aḥmad Amīn, *Ḍuḥā al-Islām* II (Cairo, 1938) 204; see also *GAL* I 172 and S I 291. Large personal libraries became more or less the rule with scholars of the second half of the 2d century, including the well known Wāqadī and Aṣmā'i (cf.

Dimnah is referred to both as *daftar* and as *kitāb*.¹ Interesting in this connection is the early and widespread practice of citing an authority by name rather than by title of work, even when the existence of the work is unquestioned and its use is general. This practice has no doubt submerged much of the evidence that the use of titles would have provided in support of the existence of a large body of written, as against oral, literature not only in *ḥadīth* but in all other branches of intellectual activity.²

The progressive increase in the size and number of royal libraries,³ such as those of Mu'āwiyah, Khālīd ibn Yazīd, Walīd II, and Hishām, and of libraries of scholars, such as those mentioned above, was paralleled by a progressive increase in private and public book sales. Earliest book purchases were made in non-Muslim communities, which were not restricted in their book trade among themselves or among the Arabs.⁴ By contrast, the sale of sacred literature (*bai' al-'ilm*), including even the Qur'ān, was at first a point of religious controversy. But by the end of the first century the practice had already been rationalized and was becoming increasingly widespread.⁵ Increasing demand for books, both religious and secular, was generated by the vigorous and aggressive ruling Muslim community, rapidly accelerating its rate of literacy, zealously spreading its new faith, and coveting increasing recognition for its mother tongue in church, state, and scholarship (see pp. 28 f.). The demand was met both by the increased output of original manuscripts and by an effective means for their multiple production and distribution. For the ordinary stationer was being rapidly transformed from simple trader in writing materials to copyist—at first of the Qur'ān, then of *ḥadīth* and other manuscripts—and finally to book-seller and publisher, who presently found it more practical and economical at times to manufacture his own paper stock. This rapidly increasing demand for books established early and firmly the flourishing industry and the profession of *wirāqah* and *warrāq* respectively.⁶ The *warrāq* and his fellow professionals established themselves in the chief cities in a business street named after the profession, as *sūq al-warrāqīn*, or after their chief product, as *sūq al-kutub* or "Book Market Street." Reference to such a street is found as early as the time of the famous Muḥallab ibn Abī Ṣufrah (d. 82 or 83/701 or 702), who took a practical interest in *ḥadīth* and who counseled his sons to frequent the arms and book markets.⁷

Thus, while pious scholarship struggled to hold on to the idea of the absolute primacy of oral transmission, from the second half of the first century onward pamphlets and books grew and multiplied in all intellectual fields, though more in some than in others. Authors, copyists, compilers, and publishers earned an honorable living while their end-product—books—filled treasured private trunks, graced library shelves, and stocked booksellers' shops. It was to such shops that Ibn Ishāq resorted, while he was still in Medina in the last decades of the Umayyads, for available written sources, without benefit of oral transmission, for his ambitious universal history.⁸ His contemporary Shu'aib ibn Dīnār

Gurgīs 'Awwād, *Khazā'in*, pp. 193 f. and references there cited). A less known and younger contemporary, Abū Ḥasan al-Ziyādī (ca. 156–243/773–857), was a bibliophile (cf. *Fihrist*, p. 110; Khaṭīb VII 358). The great increase in royal, public, and private libraries from the 3d century on is generally conceded and need not detain us here.

¹ Jāḥiẓ, *Thalath rasā'il* (*Three Essays*), ed. Joshua Finkel (Cairo, 1926) p. 42; *Fihrist*, p. 118; Mas'ūdi VIII 291.

² Cf. Jawād 'Alī in *Majallah* I 164–66 (cf. p. 10 above).

³ See Mackensen, "Arabic books and libraries in the Umayyad period," in *AJS* LII–LIV.

⁴ Sūrah 3:77; cf. *Tafsīr* I 286–88. See also C. A. Nallino, *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti* . . . III (Roma, 1941) 120; Jawād 'Alī, *Ta'rīkh al-'Arab qabl al-Islām* I (Baghdād, 1950) 226. Nor should one overlook the early start of literary activity among non-Muslims,

writing either in defense of their own faith or in opposition to Islām, circulating their books among Muslims and non-Muslims alike, as appears from the statement of 'Abī ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī—a convert to Islām, who wrote under Mutawakkil's patronage; see his *Kitāb al-dīn wa-al-daulah*, ed. Alphonse Mingana, Arabic text (London etc., 1923) p. 20 and translation (London etc., 1922) p. 19.

⁵ See *OIP* L 29 and references there cited, for the *warrāq* Mālik ibn Dīnār (d. 130/748), and Sam'ānī, folio 579b, for the *warrāq* Abū 'Abd Allāh of Wāsiṭ (d. 159/775). See also Goldziher, *Studien* II 180–86, and Gurgīs 'Awwād, *Khazā'in*, pp. 8–25, for later practices.

⁶ Sam'ānī, folios 579b–580; Gurgīs 'Awwād, *Khazā'in*, pp. 8–25 and references there cited.

⁷ Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) I 52; cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 44.

⁸ See e.g. Khaṭīb I 229–32; cf. *Sīrah*, Introduction.

(d. 162 or 163/778–80), a secretary of the Caliph Hishām, carefully wrote down hundreds of traditions from Zuhri and then delivered his manuscripts (*kutub*) to his companions for transmission.¹ Zuhri and Hishām ibn 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, among others, were known to practice this simple *munāwalah*, in which not only a man's own materials but those which he received from others could be passed on in writing, without accompanying oral transmission, to one's pupils or fellow scholars.² A little later, Ibn Ishāq's younger contemporary and antagonist, the Medinan jurist Mālik ibn Anas, who early followed his father's instructions to chain down knowledge (*al-'ilm*) through writing³ and whose written works were already in free circulation in Medina, was practicing and defending the use of books on their own authority.⁴ Nor was 'Irāq likely to be more conservative than the Hījāz in this respect. In fact, no less a scholar than Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was suspected of using materials directly from written sources.⁵ Presently other liberal scholars such as Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī and his encyclopedic son Hishām⁶ and the historian Wāqidi⁷ fell under the ban of the pious and conservative because of this very patronage of the *warrāq* and the use of his stock, that is, for the use of books on their own authority.⁸ For us, however, the realization that books and pamphlets existed earlier and had a wider circulation than hitherto suspected should increase the value of much of the earlier material that, thanks to the practices of these authors among others of their contemporaries, have survived to our day.⁹ This is not meant to imply that these authors were infallible observers and writers, nor yet that the written record per se has not lent itself to error and forgery. Rather it is to stress the fact that human error and frailty and literary dishonesty are much more easily detectable in a body of recorded literature than they can be in a body of oral literature in any field whatsoever.

The narrowing of the gap that separates extant but late copies or versions from their originals, illustrated by the 'Aqabah folio of Ibn Hishām's *Ṣīrah* (our Document 4), clarifies the nature and extent of later changes and interpolations (see pp. 63 f.). The discovery of a lost text such as our folio from Ibn Ishāq's *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* (Document 6) throws light on the content and method of still earlier but as yet lost works such as the lengthy account by 'Amr ibn Maimūn (d. 74/693) of the assassination of 'Umar I and of the appointment of the elective council, on which Ibn Ishāq drew so extensively, generally without mentioning the author and/or his work, as we have taken such great pains to prove (see pp. 84 and 90, n. 2). These two documents have made it possible for us to compare Ibn Ishāq's own product, on the one hand, with his sources which survive in later and scattered

¹ Ibn 'Asākir VI 321.

² Ibn Sa'd V 361 f.; *Ma'ārif*, p. 246; Khaṭīb, *Kifāyah*, pp. 326 f., 329; Dhahabī I 161.

³ Ibn Sa'd VII 1, p. 14.

⁴ Cf. Khaṭīb, *Kifāyah*, p. 327; also pp. 220–23, 326–30, 352–55, for many early traditionists who followed this practice though it was frowned on by others (cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 189, 220–22).

⁵ Ibn Sa'd VII 1, p. 116.

⁶ For an estimate of the literary practices of this practical, liberal, and prolific scholar see Yāqūt II 158 and Brockelmann in *EI* II 689 f. and references there cited.

⁷ Khaṭīb III 7, 13 f., 15 f.; *Irshād* VII 56.

⁸ The traditionists feared the *warrāq* and his books as a threat to their own profession and livelihood (cf. Goldziher, *Studien* II 180–86).

⁹ The last half century has brought to light a large number of manuscript sources hitherto believed lost. Among them are works that originated in the pre-'Abbāsid period though surviving as such only in later copies or recensions. Even titles of still lost books have been increasingly discovered and noted. Some idea of the extent of these materials from the pre- and early

'Abbāsid periods and of the promise they hold for research in Islāmic scholarship in this age of microfilm are to be gained from comparing Brockelmann's new edition and monumental Supplement with the first edition of his *GAL*. The end of Arabic manuscript discoveries is not yet in sight. But the laborers are few, and fewer are the librarians trained to catalogue and so to make readily available collections already known, such as the large Islāmic manuscript and book collection in the Library of Congress.

For a list of 3d-century book manuscripts see the writer's "A ninth-century fragment of the 'Thousand Nights,'" *JNES* VIII (1949) 148 f., to which should be added a copy of Abū al-'Amaithal's *Kitāb al-ma'thūr* dated 280/893 (ed. Krenkow [London, 1925]). A few other manuscripts datable to roughly the late 3d or early 4th century are known. Of the 18 dated 4th-century manuscripts known to the writer, 6 come from the first and 12 from the second half of that century. These numbers promise to grow. The manuscripts have, apart from their contents, significant bearing on the extent of Ibn Muqlah's script reforms and on 4th-century calligraphy.

extracts and, on the other hand, with later works, be these later versions of his own product, such as Ibn Hishām's *Ṣīrah*, or independent results of succeeding historians of the caliber of Wāqidī, Ibn Sa'd, and Ṭabarī. The fact that the compared products yield essentially the same facts, attitudes, and even methods is new and powerful support for the thesis that the biography of Muḥammad was already fixed by the end of the first century¹ and direct evidence for the extension of that thesis to include the history of at least the first two caliphs, beyond which the texts of our papyrus folios do not extend. Furthermore, the collective evidence provided by the Milan fragment (see p. 2), the Heidelberg fragment (see p. 4), and two Oriental Institute fragments (No. 14046 [see p. 1] and Document 2 of the present study) suggests that a somewhat lesser degree of fixity had been attained in the same early period for the less fanciful elements of the stories of the prophets.

An accomplishment so remarkable must have called for several stages in its achievement. Muḥammad's historic mission and forceful personality must have inspired at least a few of his historically minded Companions to initiate the collection of historical documents and memoranda in private notebooks. These Companions, with religious and/or political motivation, set an example and provided a nucleus of written materials for the use of the succeeding generation. The great historical events of this second generation's own time must have provided it with an added current incentive to progress to a more formal and methodical historiography in the course of the second half of the first century of Islām. The initial researches of Sprenger and Goldziher revealed the general prevalence of *ṣuḥuf al-ṣaḥābah* or memorandum notes and initial written collections of the Companions. Again, the more recent researches of Sachau, Fück, and Horovitz on the historical works of the immediate successors of the Companions do no more and no less than generally confirm the second step called for in the development outlined above, which is itself demanded by the very existence of our historical papyri and the far-reaching significance of their content and method.

At this point one is faced with two alternative but contradictory positions: either to insist, with the skeptics, that even this advanced stage of historiography was largely oral and anonymous or forged or, in the light of our new knowledge, to accept the historians to whom the Islāmic sources credit this achievement and to regard their works as basically authentic. In taking the second position the writer must hasten to caution the reader that basic authenticity is not to be equated with scientific reliability or factuality. In other words, to accept *Akḥbār 'Ubaid*, *Kitāb al-mubtadā*, and a *Kitāb al-maghāzī* as basically authentic works of 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah, Wahb ibn Munabbih, and 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair or Zuhri, respectively, is not in itself proof enough to indicate that these works are factual histories or that their authors are reliable historians. There must be adequate supporting evidence for the materials thus transmitted—a branch of historical criticism that calls for its own special treatment. If this approach means anything at all for research scholars in this early period it is that future critical studies should concentrate on recovery of the earliest texts, in history as in other fields, and on objective evaluation of their reliability, and not take the easy way out through categorical rejection—based largely on unproved hypotheses colored by a measure of subjectivity—of a given author and/or work.

An unfortunate though in a measure understandable bias, displayed alike by early Muslim scholars and modern critics, has helped to cloud the particular view and to color the general estimate of the cultural level of the pre-'Abbāsīd period. Irrespective of party politics, the early Muslims, zealous for the new faith and eager to extol its evolving culture, belittled and underestimated the Arab culture and achievement which existed on the eve of Islām. Closing their minds to the positive factors of the so-called *ayyām al-jāhiliyah*, "days of ignorance," and forgetful even of the many pre-Islāmic practices that Muḥammad and his generation carried into Islām,² they painted the period in colors so dark as to all but obscure even its brightest spots: the widespread literacy, no matter how elementary, among

¹ Cf. Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* I 559. The thesis was advanced long ago by Muir and formed a bone of contention between him and Sprenger in the well known Muḥammadan Controversy.

² See *Fihrist*, p. 96, line 27, for reference to Hishām ibn al-Kalbī's work on this subject entitled *Mā kānat al-'Arab taf'alahu wa-yuwāfiq ḥukm al-Islām*.

the pagan South Arabians and their colonies in northern Arabia;¹ the books in use among the partly Hellenized and polyglot Jewish and Christian settlers and converts in Arabia and in the Christian Arab kingdoms of Syria and 'Irāq, where the North Arabic script itself was evolved some three centuries before Muḥammad;² and the practice in pre-Islāmic Arabia, even if comparatively rare, of writing down religious texts and political documents.³ Most but not all of the succeeding generations of Muslim scholars and historians followed too willingly the lead of their "earliest authorities," generally accepting their views of the "days of ignorance," by contrast so flattering to Islām. Even Ibn Khaldūn fell under the spell and accepted the exaggeration of the primitiveness of the pre-Islāmic Arabs and the early Umayyads. His position on the probable achievement of Khālid ibn Yazīd in the foreign sciences rests entirely on these conceptions. Khālid, according to him, was too close to the age of primitive Arab culture and too far removed from the sciences and arts in general to be able to read and comprehend books on the foreign arts and sciences.⁴ Is not Ibn Khaldūn, among others, overlooking the ambivalence in the phenomenon of "the exception to the rule"? For while the exception may sometimes prove the rule, it does at other times prove to be itself the turning point at which the old order yields to the new. Our generation has witnessed the Arabia of 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Sa'ūd provide such pivotal exceptions. Men as close to Bedouin culture and as far removed from the sciences and arts as were Khālid and his generation are proving to be adept students and practitioners of such needed practical foreign arts and sciences as the West is able and willing to teach them. No doubt some foreign scientists and artisans of Khālid's day were both able and willing to teach him and a few others who were especially endowed with natural ability and ambition. Workable rough-and-ready translations of the needed texts, be they Greek, Syriac, Old Persian, or even Sanskrit, could have posed no serious problem for the multilingual population of Khālid's own Syria and of the expanding Arab Empire that had already absorbed North Africa, Egypt, Syria, and Persia and was about to conquer Spain, Northwest India, and Central Asia. It is to be recalled that Khālid's main interest was alchemy, which at the time was closely related to medicine, and that Umayyad caliphs, princes, and governors employed polyglot Christian physicians at court from the time of Mu'āwiyah onward. Even before Khālid is supposed to have turned from politics to science, Māsirjiwaih, a Persian Jew in 'Irāq, translated in 64-65/683-85 a medical work from the Syriac translation of the original Greek.⁵ Furthermore, practical medicine was the one art in which the Arabs of Muḥammad's day had some proficiency, while the Umayyad period produced several Arab students of medicine, including Khālid ibn Yazīd, whose reputation for learning in alchemy and medicine is readily accepted by that remarkable eleventh-century historian of culture and civilization, Ibn Šā'id.⁶ Somewhat belated but interesting confirmation of the beginnings, among the Arabs, of the type of scientific literature that Khālid is credited with comes from the famous Bīrūnī (362-440/972-1048), who knew and used a work on precious stones and metals that originated, according to him, in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik.⁷

On the whole, Ibn Šā'id's brief account and clear-cut estimate of Arab culture on the eve of Islām and through the Umayyad period is more objective and better balanced than that implied by historians

¹ See Lankester Harding and Enno Littmann, *Some Thamudic Inscriptions from the Hashimite Kingdom of the Jordan* (Leiden, 1952) pp. 1 f., and the present writer's review of this work in *JNES* XIII (1954).

² *OIP* L, chap. i.

³ Cf. Jāḥiẓ, *Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) I 69 f., 86; also Aḥmad Amīn, *Fajr al-Islām* (Cairo, 1928) p. 199.

⁴ *Muqaddimah* (Būlāq, 1274) p. 261; cf. Mackensen in *AJSL* LIV 53 f.

⁵ See Philip K. Hitti, *History of Syria* (London, 1951) pp. 490, 497. Hitti, who praises Mu'āwiyah's genius in glowing terms and accepts the works of 'Ubaid and Wāḥb ibn Munabbih, seems reluctant to give Khālid the benefit of a doubt (*ibid.* pp. 439-41, 479,

492 f., 498). For the major references to Khālid and Māsirjiwaih see Mackensen in *AJSL* LIV 52-57. For a good perspective on the sciences in this period see Aḥmad Amīn, *Fajr al-Islām*, pp. 197 f., and *Ḍuḥā al-Islām* I (Cairo, 1933) 270 f.

⁶ See references cited in n. 3 on p. 21 above.

⁷ Bīrūnī, *Kitāb al-jamāhir fī ma'rifat al-jawāhir* (Ḥaidarābād, 1355) p. 50; Mohammed Jahia Haschmi, *Die Quellen des Steinbuches des Bīrūnī* (Gräfenhainichen, 1935) p. 15; see also *AJSL* LIV 60. Little is known of this work mentioned by Bīrūnī, which may or may not have been an Arabic translation instead of an original composition.

before and after him. It is readily to be seen from his account that in the secular field the practical knowledge of medicine and astronomy takes second place only to poetry and history.¹

Again, the argument is sometimes advanced that the Muslims of the pre-'Abbāsīd period were too preoccupied with military conquests, party strife, and civil wars to give much time or thought to the launching and developing of a written Arabic literature, either religious or secular.² This view considers the soldier to be completely absorbing the scholar at the same time that it divorces the ruler and administrator from any concern for or with religious and/or national educational propaganda. It is well known that neither of these propositions was true for Muḥammad the soldier-prophet, who set the accelerated educational pace of the period. On first moving to Medina he made use of some Arabs of the Aws and the Khazraj who had learned to write Arabic from the Jews of that city.³ The very fact that the Jews had already felt the need to learn to read and write Arabic is indicative of a measurable degree of literacy among at least some of the leading tribes of Arabia and the vassal Arab kingdoms to the north. That Muḥammad was not content with either the quantity or the quality of this local supply of Jewish teachers of Arabic is indicated by his policy following the victory of Badr. This included the establishment of the mosque school, where captured Meccans—and the Meccans as a whole enjoyed a reputation for literacy—were to spread literacy by teaching the young of Medina until they became thoroughly proficient. Among the first group of boys to be so educated was Zaid ibn Thābit,⁴ future secretary of Muḥammad and editor-in-chief of the 'Uthmānic edition of the Qur'ān. It was at Muḥammad's request that Zaid learned Hebrew and Syriac.⁵ Furthermore, there is some evidence that Muḥammad even encouraged some of the older generation to learn to read and write, especially some among the group known as *ahl al-suffah*, whom he is said to have called the "guests of Islām."⁶ The challenge of the times no doubt led some men in other walks of life to learn to read and write soon after Muḥammad's death, as did Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī.⁷ We do not know whether Ibn Ḥadīd, the Arab scribe of the earliest extant Islāmic document—an Egyptian papyrus dated 22/643⁸—was a young graduate of the mosque school or a non-Muslim Arab of an older or a younger generation.

Again, there were among the Companions men who functioned in the dual capacity of soldier-administrator and teacher-scholar. They included prominent Arabs like Ibn 'Abbās, 'Umar I, and even Mu'āwiyah or humble non-Arab clients like Anas ibn Mālīk the servant of Muḥammad and 'Ikrimah, the precocious pupil of Ibn 'Abbās. The *mawālī*, "clients," learned only too well the new sciences of religion—the Qur'ān, *ḥadīth*, and *sunnah*—from their masters and competed effectively in the next generation⁹ with such Arab scholars as 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, 'Abd Allāh

¹ Ibn Ṣā'id, *Ṭabaqāt al-umam*, pp. 44 f., 47 f. (= trans. Blachère, pp. 93 f., 98 f.); cf. p. 21 above.

² See Hitti, *op. cit.* p. 490; but see also Jawād 'Alī in *Majallah* I 184. The argument reflects the statement of Abū Hurairah that he devoted his life to memorizing *ḥadīth al-Nabī* while the Meccans were preoccupied with the market place and the Medinans with attending to their lands; cf. Ibn Sa'd IV 56 and note absence of reference to warfare in Muḥammad's own time.

³ Balādhurī, *Kitāb futūḥ al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Lugduni Batavorum, 1866), p. 473.

⁴ Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 14, 17; see art. "Masjad" in *EI* III 315 ff. for the expanding activities of the mosque and esp. pp. 350 f. and 360 f. for the mosque as an educational center for young and old in this early period.

⁵ Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 115; Ibn Ḥanbal V 182; Dhahabī I 29 f. See also Ibn Sa'd IV 2, p. 11, VII 2, p. 189.

⁶ Ibn Ḥanbal V 315; for *ahl al-suffah* see pp. 77 f. below. Muḥammad is also reported as saying that it is no shame for an older person to learn from the young (cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Jāmi' bayān al-'ilm wa-faḍlihi*,

ed. Muḥammad 'Abduh [Cairo, n.d.] I 87). He was also anxious to have Shafā', a woman scribe, teach his wife Ḥafṣah to write (cf. Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, p. 472). Ḥafṣah was a widow when Muḥammad married her (cf. Nabia Abbott, *Aishah, the Beloved of Mohammed* [Chicago, 1942] pp. 9 f. and references there cited).

⁷ Ibn Sa'd IV 1, p. 83.

⁸ *PERF* No. 558.

⁹ See Aḥmad Amīn, *Fajr al-Islām*, pp. 171 f., 183 f., for this initial relationship of Arab teacher and non-Arab pupil, where he modifies, with some justification, the too generalized statement of Ibn Khaldūn that non-Arabs were the culture-carriers in Islām (*Muqaddimah* [Būlāq, 1274] pp. 280 f.) as not fully applicable particularly to the religious sciences of the earliest period. Professor Aḥmad Amīn brings as a rule a detached spirit and a keen insight to the problems of Umayyad cultural history (see *Fajr al-Islām*, pp. 174–231). More recently the able 'Irāqī scholar Jawād 'Alī has sought to present to the Arabic reading public the results of past researches on some of the problems of early

ibn 'Āmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, all three of whom deliberately avoided public life and politics in order to devote themselves to their sciences and their rapidly expanding circle of pupils. But the cultural drive was by no means limited to these religious subjects and the history growing out of them. Even the period of the first four caliphs had its quota of public teachers, administrative scribes, musicians, and poets as well as of private scholars, as anyone who reads through the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd and the *Kitāb al-muḥabbar* of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb can readily see.¹ The teachers must have continued to enjoy the support and respect of the community, for more than one member of a family was encouraged to take up the profession. Such, anyway, seems to have been the case with Yūsuf ibn al-Ḥakam and his more famous son Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf,² schoolteacher, scribe, soldier, and governor, right-hand man of 'Abd al-Malik and his son Walīd I, and contemporary of Khālīd ibn Yazīd. Early in his governorship of Kūfah (74–95/694–714) Ḥajjāj picked on sight an old man, in the court of the mosque of Kūfah, as evening companion and conversationalist—one Sumairah ibn al-Ja'd, who turned out to be of the largely Khārijite tribe of Shaibān. His accomplishments included practical knowledge of the Qur'ān, the law of inheritance, general law, astronomy, and the historical poetry of witnesses (see p. 15) of the battle days of the Arabs.³ It is interesting to note that it is Ibn Khaldūn who points out the great influence at this time of the teaching profession in general and teacher-governor Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf in particular in the interest of developing and propagating the new faith and its culture as an instrument of national policy and imperial power.⁴

Apart from the public classrooms, religious circles, and royal courts of the later Umayyads, the private houses of men of affairs and men of letters served as social and literary clubhouses. 'Abd al-Ḥakam ibn 'Āmr, grandson of a Companion whom Muḥammad had seen fit to appease, kept open house at Mecca, where he provided his guests not only with chess and other foreign games of skill and chance but also with a library stocked with books, bought no doubt from a book market, on every currently known subject, *dafātir fihā min kuli 'ilm*.⁵

It would seem reasonable, therefore, to question the validity of the arguments that the Arabs on the eve of Islām were too primitive and that the early Muslim Arabs were too busy to put forth the

Islāmic historiography in an exhaustive study of the source materials of Ṭabarī (*Majallah* I 143–231 and II 153–90).

¹ See e.g. Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 104, III 1, pp. 192, 212, 258, III 2, p. 103; Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, pp. 377–79, 475–78. See Walther Björkman, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im islamischen Ägypten* (Hamburg, 1928) pp. 56–58 and references there cited, for list of early scribes and administrators. For an appreciation of first-class early teachers and secretaries see Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-bayān wa-al-tabyīn* (Cairo, 1947) I 249–52; *Ma'ārif*, pp. 271 f.

² See *Ma'ārif*, p. 271; Ibn Rustah, *Kitāb al-a'alāq al-naḥḥīyah*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, *BGA* VII (2d ed.) 214.

³ Mas'ūdī V 312–14; Sumairah was shamed by the famed Khārijite poet Qaṭrī into leaving Ḥajjāj (*ibid.* pp. 314–17). For Qaṭrī see Saḥīr al-Qalamāwī, *Adab al-Khawārij*, pp. 56–74. The subjects listed above might be compared with those said to have been discussed in Ibn 'Abbās' circle (cf. Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 122; Khaṭīb I 174 f.; see also p. 14 above).

⁴ *Muqaddimah* (Būlāq, 1274) pp. 14 f. 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Mas'ūd al-Khuzā'i (710–89/1310–87), an older contemporary and a compatriot of Ibn Khaldūn, took a much more favorable view of the level of Arab culture at the time of Muḥammad. Lengthy extracts from his *Takhrīj al-dalālāt al-ṣamīyah 'alā mā kāna fī 'ahd rasūl Allāh* appear in a rather recent work

of yet a third North African scholar, Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī's *Kitāb al-tarātīb al-idāriyah* (Ribāt, 1346). Kattānī subscribes wholeheartedly to Khuzā'i's thesis and endeavors to supplement it, but his treatment of Khuzā'i's text and his methodology and documentation leave much to be desired for the critical Western scholar. Khuzā'i himself still remains practically unknown (see *GAL* S III 1276 f.) despite several medieval biographical notices and a lengthy biography of the man and his scholarly activities to be found in Kattānī's work (Vol. I 26–35). The *Takhrīj*, quite obviously, deserves a complete scholarly publication in its own right.

⁵ *Aghānī* IV 51 f.; see also above (p. 24). 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Kātib (d. 132/750), famed state secretary, literary stylist, and author, tells in his *Risālah fī al-saṭranj* how the last Umayyad caliph, Marwān II, became alarmed at the widespread popularity of chess and the numerous clubs formed by its devotees (see Muḥammad Kurd 'Alī, *Rasā'il al-bulaghā* [Cairo, 1913] p. 166). Jāḥiẓ tells of a more exclusive literary club whose members, including Ibn al-Muqaffa', devoted their sessions to social drinking and poetry (see *Aghānī* XVI 148 f.). One need hardly mention the great preoccupation with music and singers to drive home the point that the upper-class Arabs of the Umayyad period and their clients had plenty of leisure time.

INTRODUCTION

kind and amount of intellectual effort necessary to produce some written literature, either religious or secular (over and above the editions of the Qur'ān), and to make a beginning toward the study and translation of foreign sciences. Both arguments are lacking in specifically demonstrable historical evidence and do not, therefore, deserve the widespread emphasis, let alone the degree of acceptance, that they have received from time to time among Muslim and Western scholars alike down to our own day. On the whole, and keeping well in mind that no matter how "unscientific" the early Islāmic "sciences" appear in comparison with classical and/or modern standards, we find that the cumulative cultural achievement of the Umayyad period was as remarkable as were its territorial conquests. But, while the latter could not be overlooked or denied, the cultural achievement could be and was obliterated, misrepresented, and/or appropriated by succeeding rival revolutionary dynasties. Jāhiz, who was fully aware of the service of books to the historical continuity of culture and civilization despite the many hazards and setbacks involved in dynastic cultural rivalries, points, among other illustrations, to the 'Abbāsīd destruction of Umayyad architectural remains as a phase of such dynastic rivalries.¹

If these facts mean anything for the future of Islāmic scholarship in the light of the over-all implications so far of our literary papyri, they should present a new challenge to dig deeper for and to examine more minutely and objectively materials bearing on the cultural history of the Near East in general and of the Arab world in particular in the half millennium from A.D. 300 to 800. The Islāmic sources should be sifted more carefully for bias against the "days of ignorance." Non-Islamic sources should be sifted as carefully for anti-pagan and anti-Islāmic prejudice. The literary papyri already on hand—judging from the results here presented and from research already in progress on the group of *ḥadīth* papyri and to a lesser extent on the few poetry fragments—promise to redeem the cultural reputation of the Umayyads and their age as administrative papyri, Greek and Arabic, have already redeemed their reputation in statecraft.

Yet many are the tantalizing questions for this period and the earlier periods that still demand answers. What indeed were the level and the extent of literacy among the Arabs of Muḥammad's own generation? The few names of known literates have been preserved largely because their bearers came at some time in their lives in contact with Muḥammad. A test case made recently by the present writer in scanning the entire *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd has about doubled the number of names generally encountered in later sources. Does even this longer list of names cover *all* the literates of Muḥammad's generation and of that of his older contemporaries? What did these literates read or write before Muḥammad called most of them to act as scribes, missionaries, and governors? Did they just keep commercial records and memoranda, scribble private notes to distant ones, or write brief and fleeting verses of poetry? Or did they indeed commit their prize poems to writing or even treasure some Arabic Biblical texts or legends? Does not the official and public use of the North Arabic script in the bilingual Greek-Arabic inscription of Ḥarrān of A.D. 568 and in the still earlier trilingual Christian inscription of Zabad dated A.D. 512 bespeak earlier and private use of this script by the Christian Arabs in their religious and private lives? Just exactly what use, beside commercial, did the Jews of Medina make of their knowledge of Arabic writing on the eve of Islām? Were not their pre-Islamic treaties with the Arab tribes of the Aws and the Khazraj indeed committed to writing in Arabic? These questions are not new; they have been raised from time to time to become the center of controversy.² They are recalled here to stress the fact that, with the literary papyri and the research which they entail yielding increasing evidence of a high level of culture under the Umayyads, the current opinion concerning the level of Arab culture in the time of Muḥammad, and earlier, needs to be somewhat revised. This fact calls for scientific re-examination of all the pertinent sources. The final answers that can remove these and related questions from the controversial field perhaps lie in some dusty Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ḥimyarite, or early Arabic text that has some bearing on the cultural history of Oriental

¹ *Ḥayawān* (Cairo, 1938) I 73, 86 f.

² Cf. *OIP* L, chap. i and references there cited; see also pp. 48–50 below.

churches and their Arab converts on the eve of Islām.¹ Or they may lie in some extant but as yet unrecognized literary papyrus fragments or more likely in papyrus and parchment fragments and texts still buried in the sands of Egypt and Syria or in the caves of Jordan and Israel. To judge by the conclusions culled from the few literary papyri on hand, a major find of dated and datable literary texts from the first decades of Islām would lead more directly than will any other channel to the answers sought. Such a find would lay a firm foundation for the study of Arab history and culture at the dawn of Islām and would begin a new era for all Islāmic studies.

¹ A fresh start toward objective re-evaluation of the economic and political life in Arabia on the eve of Islām is Sidney Smith's recent article "Events in Arabia in the 6th century A.D." (University of London, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* XVI [1954] 425-68), which draws on the multilingual literature bearing on the period. The author departs from the

prevailing hypercritical approach to these problems. He restores a needed measure of confidence in the Arabic sources as these are painstakingly examined in the light of non-Arabic materials and concludes that Arabia and the Arabs were on a higher level of economic and political culture than has hitherto been conceded (see esp. pp. 433 f., 463-68).

1

GOD AND THE CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE

PERF No. 734. First half of third/ninth century.

Papyrus fragment 10 × 16 cm. Reconstruction of Qur'ānic passage points to a book page about 15 cm. wide, including the quite narrow margins. An approximate length for the page cannot be determined, for the piece is broken off at the top, though in all probability not many lines are missing.

Script.—Small cursive early book hand of fair execution. The recto is readily legible except for a few faint words which, along with the greater part of the verso, do not stand out very well. Diacritical points are sparingly used. A small separate *hā'* is found under the *hadd* in recto 6, and in the same line an open instead of a closed *tā'* is used in the word '*ā'iqat*. Medial '*ain* is markedly triangular. *Dammah*, *fathah*, and *kasrah* are each used once (recto 15, verso 19). The *hamzah* is not indicated. A small circle serves for punctuation. A word is broken at the end of a line in several instances.

TEXT

RECTO

. [] 1
قلت الا لقن عن تفسير صفته والجسد] 2
فلم تجد مساعا فرجعت فالجسد في] 3
لقدير وانما يقال كيف كان سيران] 4
انه لا يعلم كيف هو الا هو ○ فقد تجد] 5
ليس لصفته شى منه حد ولا عائفة ولا سها] 6
مع ذلك الحق المبين احق وابين مما اتى] 7
والامور والضلمات والنور والهوى] 8
يشاء ثم لا يمنعه ذلك جل جلاله ان يعلم] 9
العالم بعدل حكمه وعزة قدرته واحاط] 10
[بكل شى علما] الذى يختبر فيما خلق ويعبد من الحيوان] 11
اليه من احد سبقه الى صنعة خلقه] 12
في الاهواء والالواء] 13
الفعال الذى اراه العيون الناظرة من الناظر] 14
[الخلائق من عجائب صنعه لا تدركه]ا] 15
العقول ولا تحصيها العقول فان علمنا] 16
[نطق ذات بلا عم]ل] 17
[فامرهم فيهن ماض يدير] 18

- 19] ليس ما اراد منه مع[قول]
 20] فلا في اي صورة منه[
 21] مبصرا وهو اقرب

VERSO

- 1 وهو الذى وحى في السماء عمارتها و]
 2 مليكتة وارضها لعزه قل صنعها لـ]
 3 من الانجاس والاهانية تنجا وزينها بالا[لوان
 4 وقال يصف البغو]
 5 شبه لله حتى العزة والسلطان والبلاء والـ]
 6 وشكره على نجاته لانه الدائم بلا]
 7 القائم في حكمه القادر في صنعه الـ في هـ وانا لله]
 8 وانا اليه راجعون ○ الذى خلق الخ[لق
 9 وبقدرته خلقها مخلقا فتبارك وجهه و[ليس كمثل
 10 شى وهو السميع البصير ○ خلق الخلق] و بقدر
 11 رته احياء وابقاء بقاء كيف شاء على ما شـ[اء
 12 وبقدرته انشاها ومخلقا لبراء شخصه]
 13 ان الله بعلمه خلقها وبقدرته ابقاهـ[ا
 14 لها مانع يعجز الباغيون عن صفتها والوا[نها واشكالها
 15 لما لا يعلموا من القديم خلقها واحيا[ها و
 16 جعل لها منقعا]
 17 طعامها معـ[ا
 18 وجعل لها عضـ[ون
 19 متراكبة]

TRANSLATION

RECTO

- 1 (traces only)
 2 . . . I say: except to refrain from explanatory comment on His quality. And the body
 3 . . . it found no quick passage and so it returned. And the body
 4 . . . verily (He is) able. And then it is said how was the manner of its proceeding
 5 . . . because no (one) knows how it is except Him. It finds
 6 . . . there is not in His quality anything in which (is) limitation, hindrance, or oversight.
 7 . . . with manifest truth, more true and clear than came
 8 . . . and the affairs, and the darkness, and the light, and the air
 9 [. . . what He] desires. Moreover, that does not prevent Him, great is His majesty, from knowing
 10 [. . . He created] creation through His just decrees and mighty power and "He comprehended

- 11 [all things in His knowledge"]. (He is the One) who is known through His creation and is served
by the animal creation
12 . . . to Him anyone who preceded Him in making His creation
13 . . . in inclination or inspiration
14 [. . . He is] the Doer who showed him the seeing eye from the Seer (Himself)
15 . . . the creatures among the wonders of His benefits not comprehended by
16 . . . intelligence nor completely understood by reason and then if we know
17 . . . inherently rational without agen[cy]
18 . . . and His order regarding them is effective controlling
19 . . . what He desired by it is incomp[rehensible to]
20 . . . not in any of its forms.
21 . . . perception, and that is nearer.

VERSO

- 1 And He revealed in heaven its prosperous state . . .
2 for His own sovereign possession, and its earth for His glory. He made it for [His . . .]
3 free from all impurity and debasement. And He beautified it with col[ors . . .].
4 And he said describing envious oppression . . .
5 likened to God even (to His) glory, authority and the testing (of men) and the . . .
6 And he thanked Him for his escape, for He is the everlasting, without . . .
7 the dispenser of His judgment, the determiner of His deeds, the [. . . of His . . . "for we are God's]
8 and to Him do we return." He who created crea[tion . . .]
9 and by His power He created it perfectly adjusted, blessed is His countenance and ["there is
nothing like unto Him],
10 and He is the Hearing, the Seeing." He created creation [. . . and by His pow-]
11 er He brought to life and caused to survive a survival as He wished and according to that which
[He] de[sired . . .].
12 And by His power He produced a complete creation adapted to the manifestation of this
person
13 For God created it by His knowledge and by His power caused it to survive . . .
14 hindrance to it. (Even) they who try cannot comprehend its quality, its color[ing and its forms]
15 because they do not know He created it from of old and brought it into exist[ence . . .].
16 He provided it with thirst-quenching [waters . . .]
17 its food along with it
18 And He made for it par[ts . . .]
19 well fitted together

Comments.—Where lines and/or sentences are much broken, the textual comments can be, perforce, only suggestive.

Recto 1. The line may have contained a section heading marked off by circles as in verso 4.

Recto 2–5. The author injects a parenthetical comment on the preceding section of the text. The passage could refer, in general, to processes and endeavors of a noncorporeal entity on first entering a body which is not necessarily a human body. Such processes are known to God only (cf. Mas'ūdī IV 101 f.; Maqdisi II 10, 100–103). This reflects orthodox Islām's aversion to speculation on God's attributes and His mysterious ways in and through His creation. Ghazālī expresses it thus: "Woe and again woe to him who says 'why?' and 'how?'" (*Kitāb al-arba'in fi uṣūl al-dīn* [2d ed.; Cairo, 1925] p. 266). But again the passage could refer to God's breathing His spirit, *rūḥ*, into Adam as told in Sūrah 15:29. Here, too, knowledge of the nature and processes of the spirit are expressly withheld from man (Sūrah 17:87).

Among the stories that early grew about the creation of Adam were those that dwelt on the difficulties experienced by the spirit in passing through the narrow and dark passages of mouth and nostrils. God commanded the spirit to force its way through these (and to force its way out again at death; see p. 44). The spirit then moved into the body slowly and by different stages, beginning with the head and ending with the feet, quickening each part in passing. This, according to some, was done in five stages of a hundred years each, a vague but interesting early evolutionary concept. Before the last stage was reached or completed, Adam grew impatient to stand on his feet. It is in reference to this that Sūrah 21:37 reads: "Man was created of haste; I shall show you My signs, so do not be over hasty." Cf. also *Tijān*, pp. 6 f.; Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 7-9; Kisā'i, pp. 26 f.; Tha'labī, *Kitāb qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* (Cairo, 1896) p. 16; Ṭabarī I 91-93; *Tafsīr* XV 35; Maqdisī II 87.

Recto 5-7. Though reference is made to the attributes of God, these do not seem to be the main topic under discussion. Some of the phrases have a decided Qur'ānic flavor (cf. e.g. Sūrahs 10:5, 24:25, 28:81).

Recto 7-13. These lines continue the main theme, namely God's initial creation of the universe through His essential powers, in self-expression, and for His own purposes. The passage is rich in Qur'ānic flavor and quotations (cf. e.g. Sūrahs 2:253, 65:12, 51:56, and 53:2-4 for lines 9, 10, 11, and 13 respectively). See below (n. 3 on p. 36) for further comment on line 13.

Recto 14-16. Note the use of *ḍammah* with *ṣun'*, "benefit," as distinguished from *ṣan'*, "creation," of line 12. The wonders of God's creation and of His benefits cannot be comprehended by His creatures.

Recto 17-21. A general reference to the creation of all rational beings and to the limits of reason in comprehending the Creator's own essence and deeds; cf. Mas'ūdī IV 105 for somewhat similar phraseology. The text breaks off, with the loss of the first few lines of the verso.

Verso 1-3. For the creation of the world in initial purity and in beauty of color, see Sūrah 35:26 f.; Mas'ūdī I 49, 52.

Verso 4. The line starts a new paragraph on the entry of envious oppression and of perversion. See Lane, art. "Baghā," and also the Qur'ānic use of the verb and its derivatives, especially in Sūrah 38:21.

Verso 4-5. In the light of the Islāmic version of the fall of both Satan and Adam, lines 4-5 can refer only to the former, who alone in his pride aspired to liken himself to God; cf. Ṭabarī I 78 f.; Maqdisī II 83; Nawawī, pp. 124 f. This last, after reporting Satan's usual argument for his own superiority to man, namely that he, Satan, was created of fire while man was created of earth, adds an unusual argument intended to prove that earth is superior to fire.

Verso 6-8. Line 6 must refer to Satan's gratitude for his escape from complete destruction at the hand of God and for the power God gave him over the earth and its creatures, including man (cf. Sūrahs 15:26-44, 38:71-75; Ṭabarī I 78-111). The passage closes with Sūrah 2:156.

Verso 8-10. Further contemplation of God's perfect and powerful ways in His creation and of His uniqueness. The sense of the passage is reinforced by Sūrah 42:11.

Verso 10-14. These lines strike again some of the main notes of the theme of recto 7-13 and follow up with the question of survival, which can be considered in terms either of the survival of the universe or of this earth alone (cf. Sūrah 55:26 f.; Maqdisī I 12 and II 133 ff.). Line 13 brings to mind Sūrah 30:54: "He creates what He wills, He is the All-Knowing, the All-Powerful."

Verso 14-15. Space calls for the reconstruction of just one word at the end of line 15. The word اشكالها seems quite appropriate in the context. Other possibilities are اعضاؤها, "its members," اعمالها, "its workings," احوالها, "its condition" or "state," احكامها, "its regulation," all of which occur in this connection in the story of creation. See comment on verso 1-3 for color in creation. The reference to the creation of the world reflects Islām's early and lively speculation on the age of the world, the order, and the time consumed in its creation. Islām's universal historians recorded the Qur'ānic, Biblical, Zoroastrian, and other versions of the story of creation (cf. Ṭabarī I 1-155; Mas'ūdī I 46-83 and IV 100-114; Maqdisī I 10-12).

Verso 16-19. Note the use of *kasrah* in line 19. God supplied all the needs of the world, providing it with water and food, and co-ordinated the structure and function of its parts (cf. Mas'ūdī I 48 f.).

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

The problems involved in the specific classification and identification of so fragmentary a text are numerous. Still the challenge from such an early book specimen cannot be ignored, at least not until a point of diminishing returns is reached for the time being.

Karabacek, in his brief listing of the piece in *PERF*, described it as a leaf from a prayer book, Qur'ānic in style but without actual Qur'ānic quotations. The reader who has come this far already realizes the errors in these statements. On first reading, the piece suggested to the writer a possible connection with early literature on Islāmic sects and heresies. Questions of the attributes of God and their expression in the act of creation, of good and evil, of free will and predestination, of moral responsibility and justice, and of the survival of any or all of creation were already being debated in the second half of the first century of Islām. The earliest extant specimen (quoted in later works) of this type of literature is the well known *Risālah fī al-qadr* of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, written at the request of the Umayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik (65-86/685-705).¹ The second century saw the rapid growth and multiplication of sects and heresies. This led the 'Abbāsīd Maḥdī (158-69/775-85) to commission orthodox theologians—the first of the caliphs to do so—to compose books in refutation of the already widely spread works of both Islāmic and non-Islāmic sectarians.² A liberal sampling of the extant literature of this class along with a more complete reading of our papyrus text led the present writer to a change of emphasis from doctrine and sects³ to the story of creation itself.

The Islāmic record of the story of creation has come down to us in more than one literary form and tradition. There is the Qur'ānic version to be gathered from widely scattered verses and chapters throughout the book. Closely linked with these are passages in Qur'ānic commentaries supported by a considerable body of Tradition such as are found in Ṭabarī's *Tafsīr* and Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* (Books 59 and 60, on the "Beginning of Creation" and the "Prophets" respectively). There was also the story form, delivered at first orally but soon committed to writing as professional storytellers and reporters increased and embellished their own private collections. Among the best known of such early narrators and recorders was Wahb ibn Munabbih (d. 110 or 114/728 or 732). He drew freely on Old Testament and Israelite tales and on his own resourceful imagination. His *Isrā'īliyyāt* have not survived as such. His grandson 'Abd al-Mun'im (d. 229/843) is credited with a book on creation based on Wahb's authority. This too has not survived, though it has already been suggested by the present writer that Oriental Institute No. 14046 is probably a leaf from this work.⁴ However, the *Tījān* of Wahb has survived in the later version of Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833). It includes in its introduction an account of the creation, followed by stories of the prophets. These offer no close parallel to our papyrus text.

¹ Ed. H. Ritter in *Der Islam* XXI 67-83.

² Cf. Mas'ūdī VIII 293.

³ The phrase *al-ahwā' wa-al-awḥā'* of recto 13 is a reflection of Sūrah 53:2-5, which itself is a reference to Muḥammad's divine inspiration (*wahī*, pl. *awḥā'*) in contrast to his own inclination (*hawā'*, pl. *ahwā'*). By stages these key words acquired connotations and distinctions that eventually placed them in the directly opposed camps of the heretical and the orthodox respectively. The *ahl al-ahwā'* were generally associated with *ahl al-bid'ah* and *ahl al-kalām* in opposition to *ahl al-sunnah* and *ahl al-ḥadīth*; cf. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's *Risālah* in *Der Islam* XXI 68 f., 77; Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 134; Dārimī, *Sunan* (Damascus, 1349) I 91-93, 108-10; Ibn

Qutaibah, *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Cairo, 1326); Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Yāmi' bayān al-'ilm* II 96, 199; Maqdisī IV 174 f.; Ibn 'Asākir, *Tabyīn kadhīb al-muftarī* (Damascus, 1347) 79-99, 333-63; Lane, art. "Hawā'." It is not surprising that some of the above-mentioned terms found their way into the titles of the earliest works on sects, such as the *Kitāb al-istiḳāmah fī al-sunnah wa-al-radd 'alā ahl al-bid'ah wa-al-ahwā'* of Nasā'ī (d. 253/867; cf. *GAL* S I 340) and Malāṭī's (d. 377/987) *Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-al-radd 'alā ahl al-ahwā' wa-al-bid'*, ed. Sven Dederling ("Bibliotheca Islamica" IX [Istanbul, 1936]).

⁴ "An Arabic papyrus in the Oriental Institute," *JNES* V 171.

Wahb and Ibn Ishāq were heavily drawn on by later authors interested mainly in the story of creation and the stories of the prophets. Best known among these are Kisā'i and Tha'labī, both of the fifth century. Comparison of the papyrus text with the pertinent sections of their works revealed a marked difference in general approach and literary style. There remained for consideration the early universal histories that treat of the story of creation. The best known in this group are the work of Ibn Ishāq in Ibn Hishām's extracts and that of Ṭabarī, Mas'ūdī, and Maqdisī. Comparison of the papyrus text, as fully indicated above in the "Comments," yielded the following results: The general approach of the papyrus text reflects that of Mas'ūdī and Maqdisī more than it does that of Ṭabarī, in either his *Ta'rikh* or his *Tafsīr*. In the frequency of related words and phrases, Maqdisī has the edge on Mas'ūdī. Furthermore, the papyrus text comes closer to Maqdisī where he is expressly drawing on Ibn Ishāq, whom he credits with the writing of the first book on the creation.¹ But even these similarities lead to no definite identification of the entire papyrus text. The most, therefore, that can be ventured at this stage is that we may have here a page from Ibn Ishāq's *Mubtada'*.²

Finally, and in the interest of exhausting the list of possible identifications, the works of three lesser known writers of the second and third centuries must be considered. The earliest of these is the Shī'ite Yūnis ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān of the circle of Mūsā ibn Ja'far al-Šādiq (d. 183/799), who wrote a *Kitāb al-bidā'* from a specifically Shī'ite point of view³ in contrast to Ibn Ishāq, who was only accused of Shī'ite tendencies. The more or less sophisticated text of the papyrus may indicate a Shī'ite source. The second possibility is the *Kitāb al-mubtada'* of Ishāq ibn Bishr (d. 206/821).⁴ The third is the *Bad' al-khalq wa-qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* of Fārisī (d. 289/902). The first two of these works are lost, and of the third only the last part has survived in what seems to be a unique manuscript at the Vatican.⁵ Fārisī, despite his name, was born and lived in Egypt. The paleography of the papyrus places it roughly in the first half of the third century. The probability certainly exists that this papyrus from Egypt may have come from his work in the earlier period of his literary activity. With this the point of diminishing returns is reached for the present.

¹ Maqdisī I 149 and II 80-83, as per our comments on verso 4-5.

² See p. 36, n. 4, and Document No. 6 (esp. pp. 87 f.).

³ *Fihrist*, p. 220; Ṭūsī, pp. 336 f., No. 803.

⁴ *Fihrist*, p. 94 (see p. 46 below).

⁵ Cf. *GAL S I* 217.

2

STORY OF ADAM AND EVE

Oriental Institute No. 17624. Late second century A.H. (ca. A.D. 800).

Medium quality brown papyrus fragment of two folios, measuring 21×7.5 cm. Reconstruction of text and allowance for lost margins would bring the width of the page to about 19.5–20 cm. There are 19 lines to the page. About two-thirds of the text of each page is lost.

Script.—Small cursive book hand of fair execution. An unusual number of letters are pointed at least once. These are *bā'*, *tā'*, *nūn*, *yā'*, *dhāl*, *jīm*, *ḍād*, *ẓā'*, and *fā'* with a dot below and *qāf* with one above. There is little that is remarkable about the individual forms of the letters themselves, except for *dāl* and *dhāl*. The small size of these two letters together with a marked final curve to the right tend to give them the appearance of a final *tā' marbūṭah*. The circle with a dot inside is used for punctuation.

TEXT

PAGE I

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|----|
| [| الى آدم وكلمه الله] | 1 |
| [| ربك ولا نهاك عن شـ] | 2 |
| [| فتصاده فيه لان هذه] | 3 |
| [| فابى آدم ذلك وقال] | 4 |
| [| يا حوا ذلك الشجرـ] | 5 |
| [| على آدم ويكون] | 6 |
| [| وقالت لآدم الـ] | 7 |
| [| ذلك ☉ | 8 |
| [| وقال محمد بن سيـ] | 9 |
| [| الاية ما نهاكما رـ] | 10 |
| [| تكونا من الخالدين و] | 11 |
| [| بغور فاقطعـ] | 12 |
| [| وشجعت آدم على الـ] | 13 |
| [| انه كان اكل] | 14 |
| [| ولم يخلقه للجنة] | 15 |
| [| يعذبهم الى يوم] | 16 |
| [| وتحولت تلك الـ] | 17 |
| [| عرس الناس بابه] | 18 |
| [| زعـم] | 19 |

STORY OF ADAM AND EVE

39

PAGE 2

1	[من ثمار الجنة طاهرا]
2	[لا الله شوكا وتعلق]
3	[المليكة ان ادفعوا]
4	[ده ثم يدفعوه]
5	[يا رب انك]
6	[فكفت عنه]
7	[]
8	[رس-ول الله صلوات]
9	[على ظهر الارض]
10	[عد-ند بوذ فيه اهبط]
11	[كان حملة آدم من]
12	[اجى على ظهر]
13	[من اليمين يقال له]
14	[]
15	[آدم من الجنة]
16	[لها امساً ورا سواد]
17	[ح-و]ا فقال لها يا حوا]
18	[ان امساً نظر الى تلك]
19	[حوا فلم يفيد البكاء]

PAGE 3

1	على الجنة فاقد]م
2	ويتب عنك ربك]
3	وعلى عقبك الى يوم [الدين
4	يحفظ روحك فى]
5	وقال هذا ما صنع
6	فلما علمه وكسا]
7	وكذلك قول الله [اهبطا منها جميعا بعضهم لبعض عدو فاما ياتينكم]
8	منى هدى فمن اتبع [هداى فلا يضل ولا يشقى
9	زعم]
10	آدم يآدم خذ]مرأتك
11	وصدق بوعدى اعـ]

[انى انا الله لا الله الا]	12
[مما قضا الله على] آدم	13
[سعيد بن المسيب]	14
[على آدم من شر الـ]	15
[ومنها ما يشاء فلى	16
[الدين الذى عند الـ]	17
[[ف]يه عبرة ثم س[يئة]	18
[اتبعنا نبيك وانزل عـ]	19
[انا الله وحيدى]	20

PAGE 4

[1
[الى الله وامره	2
[الصلوة وهى الصلوة	3
[الكلام وقضا ربك	4
[الشرايع والصدق	5
[6
[كل فرض له حدود الا	7
[الصلوات وفرائض	8
[جيدة وعز فانه ربوك	9
[ما فيه سودا	10
[ارتفعت الى ركبته ثم	11
[ارتفعت الى ترقوته	12
[لا من الصلوات الظهر	13
[14
[رسول الله صلى	15
[زعم عامر ان آدم	16
[السودا من ترقوته]	17
[قاض عليه العـ]	18
[قال ثم اتاه عـ]	19

SUMMARY OF TEXT

The piece is too fragmentary to be translated. The text touches on the following episodes in the Islāmic version of the basically Biblical story of Adam and Eve.

The forbidden fruit (p. 1:1-2). Eve is deceived by Iblīs or Satan and in turn tempts Adam to eat of the fruit (p. 1:3-18). Adam and Eve are turned out of the Garden (p. 2:1-7). They land on earth on a hill called "Baudh" (p. 2:8-13). The distressed Eve weeps, and Adam seeks to comfort her (p. 2:15-19). God repents toward His fallen creatures and holds out a promise of salvation but decrees enmity between man and Satan (p. 3:1-8). Specific traditions on some of these themes and on the emphasis on the unity of God (p. 3:9-17). God legislates for man through His prophets from Adam onward (pp. 3:18-4:9). The death of Adam (p. 4:10-19).

Comments.—Page 1:1. Note that God is speaking not through an angel but directly to Adam (see also Comments for p. 3:1-4, 19).

Page 1:2-8. Satan (Iblīs), having failed in a direct attempt to trick Adam into eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree, enlists Eve's aid successfully. Contrary to J. Eisenberg's statement in the *EI* art. "Ḥawwā," Sūrah 7:20 does not put the blame for the fall primarily on Eve. Actually the Qur'ānic version makes Adam and Eve equally culpable (see Sūrahs 2:35-38, 7:11-27, 20:116-23). However, Islāmic traditions drawing on Biblical tales and Jewish legends go all out in the condemnation of Eve. Fair samples of such traditional views are to be found in Ṭabarī's commentary on these Qur'ānic passages as well as in his history (see *Tafsīr* I 174-90, VIII 95-99, XVI 144-47; Ṭabarī I 105-9; see also below, Comments for p. 3:14-15). The commentaries of Ibn 'Abbās and Baghawī are primarily linguistic and therefore not so fruitful on this point as Ṭabarī. The latter (in Ṭabarī I 105 and *Tafsīr* XVI 146 f.) gives a passage that in part resembles closely what is left of the papyrus text of lines 4-8. The passage is a tradition cited on the authority of Suddī (d. 127/744-45) and reads: فابى آدم ان ياكل منها فتقدمت حوا فاكلت ثم قالت يا آدم كل فاني اكلت فلم يضرني "Adam refused to eat of it (tree or fruit); but Eve came forward and ate and then she said, 'O Adam eat, for I have eaten (of it) and it does not harm me.'"

Early Greco-Syriac Christian legends of the temptation and fall of man generally repeat or echo the apocryphal and other Jewish legendary versions of the story. Here and there, however, one comes across a refreshing point of view where now Adam, now Eve, is portrayed as taking the full responsibility for their disobedience. In one version (coming via the Ethiopic) Eve assumes all the blame and pleads with God to spare Adam (see S. C. Malan, *The Book of Adam and Eve* [London, 1882] pp. 7, 21). In another version (Syriac) Adam himself seeks to exonerate Eve of all blame: "O God my Creator! Thou hast given me reason and an enlightened heart. When Thou didst forbid me to eat of the fruit of the tree, Eve was not yet made, and she did not hear Thy command" (see Sabine Baring-Gould, *Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets* . . . [New York: Hurst & Co., n.d.] p. 62). This is reflected in early Christian Arabic versions where one reads: ولم تكن (حوا) سمعت من الرب تقدمت اسماءه ما كان; اوصى به آدم من امر الشجرة; see Carl Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* II (Leipzig, 1888) 27; Margaret Dunlop Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica* ("Studia Sinaitica" VIII [London, 1901] Arabic text, p. 9). So far the early Islāmic tradition has brought no such view to light, despite the fact that these Greco-Syriac tales must have been known, orally at least, to some of the earliest traditionists and authors in Islām (see pp. 46 f. below). Later, Ibn al-Jauzī (d. 597/1200) gave a chivalrous interpretation to Sūrah 20:119, where Adam (alone) is reported as having rebelled against his Lord and erred. Eve was not mentioned, says Ibn al-Jauzī, because "to shield the women is noble" (cf. Suyūṭī, *Kanz al-madfūn* [Cairo, 1939] p. 369).

Page 1:9-12. Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728), a famous traditionist, is here explaining the connection of Sūrah 7:19-21 with the text. He is frequently cited as an early authority along with Sa'id ibn al-Musayyib of page 3:3, 13 and 'Āmir of page 4:16.

Page 1:12-13. The partial reconstruction is suggested by Ṭabarī I 106 f.

Page 1:15. The line has reference to the belief that Adam was formed not only *from* earth but also *for* the earth (cf. Ṭabarī I 103; Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 11; Malan, *op. cit.*, pp. 9, 15 f.). Attention has already been drawn to an unusual attempt to glorify earth above fire. The idea did not take hold. The warning

of "dust thou art to dust returnest," whether or not spoken of the soul, pervaded Islāmic religious thought from the Qur'ānic story of the creation of Adam onward; see Ghazālī, *Kitāb ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* (Būlāq, 1289) III 324 f., 335-37, for the classical treatment of man's mean origin and end on this earth.

Page 1:16. For the phrase *yaum al-dīn* here and on page 3:3 cf. Sūrahs 15:34 f., 38:77 f. Other possible readings are *yaum al-qiyyamah*, *yaum al-ākhir*, *yaum al-jam'*, *yaum al-faṣl*, and *yaum al-talāqī* (cf. Sūrahs 21:47, 75:6, 2:62, 64:9, and 40:15 respectively).

Page 1:18. It is not clear who is alighting at whose door.

Page 1:19. Note the use of *za'ama* here and on pages 3:8 and 4:14. It interchanges with the more familiar *qāla*. This practice, common in early Islām, lost favor as *za'am* became more or less associated with false traditions (cf. Muslim I 45 and Goldziher, *Studien* II 51 f.). The word may have been followed in each instance of the papyrus text by the name of a well known traditionist, as is the case on page 4:14. On the other hand, the first two instances could follow another early Islāmic usage and read *za'ama ba'd ahl al-'ilm*, "Some of the learned claim. . ."

Page 2:1-4. Adam is anxious to take some of the fruits of the Garden with him down to earth (cf. Mas'ūdī I 61 f. and his *Akhbār al-zamān* [Cairo, 1938] p. 50). As Adam is driven out of the Garden he is caught on some thorny bushes or trees. Nevertheless, the angels continue to drive him out (cf. Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 9, 12, 26; Ṭabarī I 162; Mas'ūdī, *Akhbār al-zamān*, p. 49).

Page 2:5-6. This must, in some way, have reference to Adam pleading with his Lord, who then refrains from afflicting him further. A similar idea is conveyed on page 3:1-8.

Page 2:8-9. Note the brief formula of blessing on Muḥammad and cf. page 4:15-16 for variant.

Page 2:9-12. The word بؤذ is clearly pointed to read "Baudh" or "Būdh." The form is met with in the early literary sources, where, however, it is sometimes mispointed to read "Naudh" (see Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī, *Kitāb al-aṣnām*, ed. Aḥmad Zakī [2d ed.; Cairo, 1924] pp. 50 f.; Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 11; Ṭabarī I 119-21, 124, 133, 163; Yāqūt IV 822). According to tradition the hill on which Adam is supposed to have landed on earth is located in India, and, more precisely, on the island of Ceylon, where it has long been known as "Adam's Peak" (cf. *BGA* VI [1889] 60-70; *EI*, art. "Ceylon"; Funk & Wagnalls *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend*, ed. Maria Leach [New York, 1949-50] I 9).

Page 2:13-14. It is not clear what role is assigned at this point in the papyrus to Yemen. Tradition has it that when trouble arose between Cain and Abel, Cain took his twin sister and the two fled from the hill of Baudh to Aden in Yemen; cf. Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 14, and Ṭabarī I 144, both of whom record also a tradition from the early Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī according to which the fugitives landed in Ḥuḍaīḍ or possibly Ḥuṣaiṣ. Yāqūt does not list the first and places the second in the Najd (Yāqūt II 281). Ya'qūbī I 4 introduces more confusion by having Cain flee "from the sacred hill to a land called Baudh" (printed text has "Naudh").

The earthly "Garden of Aden" is not to be confused with the heavenly one (cf. Sūrahs 9:73, 20:76; Baiḍāwī, *Anwār al-tanzīl*, ed. H. L. Fleischer, I [Lipsiae, 1846] 39, 393; Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* II 19, 21, 23).

Pages 2:15-3:1. This great fear of the dark night and the grievous and prolonged weeping for the loss of the Garden are more in keeping with the Christian version of the repentance of Adam and Eve than with the Jewish tales (cf. Malan, *op. cit.* pp. 12-15; Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* II 29, 33, 35; Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica*, pp. 9, 11 f.). The prolonged weeping is reflected in Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī's account as preserved in Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 10, 13, and Ṭabarī I 133, where both Adam and Eve are said to have wept for two or three hundred years. The Christian Arabic sources just quoted put this term at one hundred years. Mas'ūdī (*Akhbār al-zamān*, p. 50) reflects this figure as the period of the separation of Adam and Eve, at the end of which God permits Adam to join Eve in Jaddah, where he finds her still weeping.

Page 3:1-4. The papyrus is broken, spotted, and creased and does not give a good reproduction. Nevertheless, the text as recovered from the document itself is reasonably certain. This passage should

be linked with pages 1:1 and 3:7-8, since all refer to God's reconciliation with the disobedient Adam and the amelioration of the judgment against him. God comforts Adam with words (not the Word) and holds out a hope of salvation for him and his descendants (cf. Sūrah 2:37; Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 26; Ya'qūbī I 3; Ṭabarī I 132; Mas'ūdī, *Akhbār al-zamān*, p. 50; also Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* II 29, and Gibson, *op. cit.* p. 10).

Page 3:5. Adam realizes that the evil which has befallen him is the work of Satan; cf. Malāṭī, *Kitāb al-tanbīh*, pp. 51 f., where Moses is said to have realized that it was Satan who led him to murder the Egyptian.

Page 3:6. Adam is aware of his nakedness and seeks to cover it (cf. Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 9 f.; Ya'qūbī I 2; Ṭabarī I 105-7, 161 f.).

Page 3:7-8. Adam is cast out of the Garden and condemned to be at enmity with his companions according to Sūrahs 20:123 and 7:24, the first of which is quoted in the text: "Get you down from it together, enemies one to the other; and if there come to you from Me guidance, then whoso followeth My guidance shall not go astray or be miserable." The commentators differ on whether this is addressed to Adam and Eve only or whether it includes Satan and the Serpent (see Ṭabarī I 107; *Tafsīr* XVI 147; Baghawī, *Ma'ālim al-tanzīl* I [Cairo, 1924] 608).

Page 3:9-12. This is either a tradition from a specific narrative or possibly a composite report. Adam is told to take his wife . . . to trust God's promise and to worship Him. The passage is related to Sūrah 20:14 (cf. *Tafsīr* XVI 97 f.).

Page 3:14-15. Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyib (d. 94/712), the famous traditionist of Medina, is credited with a tradition that makes Eve a determined temptress who, in order to bend Adam to her will, caused him to become intoxicated. The papyrus text is in all probability related to this tradition as transmitted by Ibn Ishāq and preserved in Ṭabarī I 109 and *Tafsīr* I 182. It will be recalled that Khadījah was accused of getting her father drunk in order to secure his consent to her marriage with Muḥammad. This motif is met with in other early Arab tales (see *EI*, art. "Djadhīma").

Page 3:16-17. The reference here may be to those of Adam's descendants who were to be saved, as distinct from those who would perish.

Page 3:18. The dot inside the loop of the 'ain could be intentional, though it does not occur elsewhere in the fragment. This early use of the word 'ibrah, "warning," "example," is itself worthy of note. It is illustrative of the moral and utilitarian objective of Islāmic historiography. Historical events were studied and recorded not only for the understanding of the past, but to point the way through such understanding to good and useful conduct in the interest of the individual's welfare in this world and/or the next (see pp. 6 f.).

Page 3:19. Adam is considered the first of the prophets and one who received his message for mankind direct from God Himself in contrast to those who received their message through the medium of angels (cf. Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad* [Ḥaidarābād, 1321] p. 65, No. 478; Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 10, 12; and see above, comment concerning page 1:1).

Page 3:20. The emphasis on God's unity appears also on page 3:12.

Page 4:2-5. The religious duties imposed on Adam. Lines 4-5 have reference to Sūrah 17:23: "Thy Lord has decreed that you shall not serve (or worship) any but Him. Exercise kindness with parents. . . ."

Page 4:7-9. Limits are set to all religious duties except perhaps voluntary prayer. This is a mark of God's greatness and of His kindness to His creatures, whom He releases from too burdensome demands and restrictions. Muḥammad himself was sent to lighten man's burden and ease his way through life. The point is well illustrated, in respect to prayer, in the familiar story of the *mi'rāj* or the ascension of Muḥammad into heaven, where, on a suggestion from Moses, Muḥammad pleads successfully with God to reduce the number of required daily prayers from fifty to five (cf. *Sīrah*, pp. 263-66, 268-71; Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 142-45; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, IV [Cairo, 1950] 318 f.; Goldziher, *Studien* I 36; Horovitz in *EI* III 507).

Page 4:10–12. Adam's death. Line 10 refers to the melancholia associated with the action of gall. The rest describes the process by which life leaves the body, starting with the feet and working up gradually until it leaves through the nostrils, thus reversing the steps by which it first quickens the body. Life always enters or leaves reluctantly (cf. *Sūrah* 75:26–30; *Tafsir* XXIX 105 f.; see below, Comment on lines 16–19).

Page 4:13–14. Probably another version of the theme of page 4:7–9.

Page 4:15–16. Note the formula of blessings on Muḥammad and cf. page 2:8–9.

Page 4:16–19. 'Āmir's version of Adam's death. 'Izrā'il, according to tradition, was successful in forcing the earth to yield of itself enough matter for the creation of Adam's body after the angels Gabriel, Michael, and Isrāfil had failed in this attempt. 'Izrā'il is also credited with having a hand in forcing the reluctant soul to enter the body. For this demonstration of ability he was given the function of forcing the soul out of the body at death, and so he came to be known and dreaded as the "Angel of Death" (cf. Ṭaḥāwī, *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyah fī al-'aqidah al-salafīyah* [Cairo, 1349] pp. 320 f., and see above, Comment for page 4:10–12).

'Āmir is, in all probability, 'Āmir al-Sha'bī (d. between 95 and 110, the most preferred date being 103/721), friend of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf and court favorite of 'Abd al-Malik (65–86/685–705). A famous judge and traditionist with great pride in his feats of memory, 'Āmir refused to use written traditions but saw no objection to dictating his own materials to others (cf. Ibn Sa'd VI 174; Khaṭīb XII 229, 232; Dhahabī I 74–82, esp. p. 80, and see p. 22 above).

This early Islāmic version of the death of Adam, particularly in respect to the ministration of the angels and the manner in which life leaves the body, shows a remarkable parallel to a Christian apocryphal account of the death of Joseph as told by Jesus in the Evangel of Saint James (cf. Johann Karl Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* [Lipsiae, 1832] pp. 22–38).

AUTHORSHIP AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

The textual evidence of the papyrus itself relative to its authorship and date is obviously inadequate. The title-page and the first few pages of text, where the main *isnād*'s or chains of authorities usually appear, are lost, and of the *isnād*'s that do occur in the fragment only the names of three isolated traditionists are still preserved. However, the significance of the lost materials may not be so great as appears on first sight. For it is quite probable that some of the missing authorities of pages 1:19, 2:8, 2:15, 3:9, 4:7, and 4:14 were originally anonymous, the references being to "some of the learned" or "those versed in history" or the "people of the Book." Certainly an impressive number of famed first-century traditionists and such well known second-century authors as Ibn Ishāq and Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī used these devices freely, particularly in the *akḥbār* or reports of the creation, the stories of the prophets, and other accounts of ancient and legendary history. Ṭabarī felt the need to comment on this general usage and to account for it on the ground of the inherent unverifiability of reports on such themes.¹ It is, therefore, quite possible that the loss here consists only of a few more names of individual and contemporary traditionists rather than a series of chains of authorities. For it is to be noted that 'Āmir (p. 4:16) is quoted on his own authority only, and it is highly probable that his fellow traditionists Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn (p. 1:9) and Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyib (p. 3:13) also are quoted solely on their own authority. Certainly these three, along with many other traditionists of the first century, are so quoted, here and in related fields, by Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarī.² Such practices were not limited to Biblical and ancient history, as Ṭabarī would, at least by implication, have us believe. The fact is that the device of the complete *isnād* itself as a tool of historical method (not to be confused

¹ E.g. Ṭabarī I 33, 56, 102 f., 121, 139 f., 146.

² E.g. Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 11, II 2, p. 3; Ṭabarī I 109 f., 182, 194, 200 f., 203.

with the early use of the *isnād* in *fiqh* and *ḥadīth* proper; see p. 9) had not yet come into wide use in first-century Islāmic historiography.

The earliest possible author of the work to which the fragment belongs would have to be a contemporary of the three above-named traditionists whom he as author could quote directly. The first name to suggest itself is that of Wahb ibn Munabbih, famed, as already stated,¹ for his *Isrā'iliyāt* and his interest in ancient story and legend. The suggestion loses some weight, however, when one considers that Wahb himself was generally content to rest on his own authority. Nevertheless the possibility was explored by comparison of the papyrus text with pertinent Wahb materials in the *Kitāb al-tijān* and in Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarī. The result was negative. Since much of Wahb's material was transmitted through his grandson 'Abd al-Mun'im (d. 229/843), in his *Kitāb al-mubtadā'*,² it seems safe to extend this negative result to include 'Abd al-Mun'im also.

The next most probable author would have to be a younger contemporary of the three Kūfan traditionists of the papyrus. Here the fragment itself provides another clue to explore, namely, the close similarity of the text of page 1:4-8 (see Comments on these lines) to a tradition transmitted by Ismā'il ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suddī (d. 127/744-45), a Ḥijāzian who had settled in Kūfah. Biographical notices credit him with a commentary on the Qur'ān and works on the campaigns and lives of Muḥammad and his Companions—*Tafsīr*, *Maghāzī*, and *Siyar*³—none of which seems to have come down to us as such. A close check on Suddī's copious materials as preserved in Ṭabarī proves him to have been definitely interested in the stories of the creation, of Adam and Eve, and of the major prophets,⁴ an interest most likely aroused and sustained in connection with his *Tafsīr* or Qur'ānic commentary. Nevertheless the search revealed no further close parallels between his materials and the papyrus text. But though Suddī himself is eliminated as the probable author of our text, one of his four main *isnād*'s⁵ or regular chains of authorities—Suddī on the authority of Abū Ṣāliḥ on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās—will prove useful in the larger question of the history of Christian Arabic literature to be discussed below.

Moving further into the second century, we find that the next possible author to be considered is obviously Ibn Ishāq (d. 152/769), who is generally credited to have been the first Muslim to write a universal history from the creation to his own time.⁶ Here, again, the only relevant connection to come to light between Ibn Ishāq's extant materials and the present papyrus is the probable text of page 3:14-15 (see Comments on these lines), and this is too inadequate to be conclusive.

There remains yet another possible second-century authorship, centering around Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763) and his son Hishām (d. 204 or 206/819 or 821). Both father and son had an insatiable historical curiosity, which led to the latter's becoming the first "encyclopedic" author in Islām. The father is credited with a *Tafsīr* or commentary on the Qur'ān, and the son with a work on Adam and his descendants.⁷ This last work Hishām received on the authority of his father, who in turn had received it, as in the case of Suddī, on the authority of Abū Ṣāliḥ on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās. The work has survived in excerpts in Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarī.⁸ Once more the text of the papyrus was checked for parallels, this time against the Kalbī materials, and once more the results proved negative in respect to the probable authorship of the work to which the papyrus belongs.

In the course of the search for clues and their follow-up, it was discovered that the text of the Oriental Institute papyrus is equally at variance with third- and fourth-century accounts of its themes as found in Ya'qūbī, Mas'ūdī, Maqdisī, and Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī. However, this search led to a comparatively

¹ See p. 36; see also p. 51.

² See n. 1.

³ *Fihrist*, p. 33; Sam'ānī, folio 294b; Ibn Taghrī-birdī I 338, 342.

⁴ Consult Ṭabarī's Index under Suddī and cross-reference with the Index entries on the major prophets.

⁵ For these four *isnād*'s see Ṭabarī I 36, 79, 90, 101 f., 104 f., 110, 155 f.

⁶ See pp. 37 and 87 f. for full discussion of Ibn Ishāq's work and its transmitters.

⁷ *Fihrist*, pp. 95-96; *Irshād* VII 252. For Hishām's numerous and varied output see *Fihrist*, pp. 95-98; *GAL* S I 331.

⁸ E.g. Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 9, 12-27; Ṭabarī I 119-21, 126 f., 132 f., 152 f., 160, 163, 165 f.; cf. pp. 46 f. below.

obscure contemporary of Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī as a possible author. This is Ishāq ibn Bishr (d. 206/821) of Bukhārā and Baghdād, who is credited with a *Kitāb al-mubtadā*.¹ In view of the fact that all of the extant materials of the other authors considered failed to produce conclusive textual parallels, there is a strong possibility that the papyrus with its rather “unique” text could belong to this somewhat discredited and lost work. Paleographic evidence places the papyrus in the same period.

Before leaving the question of authorship one should note again the fragmentary nature of the papyrus. A larger or more complete fragment from the same source could point with more certainty to one of the several authors considered above. The survival of the present book fragment encourages one to hope for the discovery of other fragments from the same codex. Arabic papyrologists with access to literary papyri unknown to or beyond the reach of the present writer would do well to be on the lookout for such materials.

II

The exhaustive research for textual parallels revealed, as a by-product, facts of greater significance for the early history of Arabic prose literature, Christian and Islāmic, than could have resulted even from the definite identification of the author of the present papyrus. To do these facts justice, it is necessary to discuss them at some length.

The publication, in 1883, of Houtsma's edition of the *Ta'rikh* of Ya'qūbī (d. 284 or 292/897 or 905) led Nöldeke² to comment on that historian's knowledge and use of an Arabic text of a Christian apocryphal story of Adam and Eve and their descendants. The original text is believed to have been a sixth-century Syriac composition. It has come down to us in several versions and has become known under several titles. The Syriac was translated before long into the several languages of the early church and more recently into German and English. The interrelationship of these versions and translations, mostly anonymous, is a tortuous one bristling with numerous unsolved problems. What is sought here is the answer to the “when” of the earliest Arabic translation or version of this work.

Significant Arabic literary evidence much earlier than Ya'qūbī's and most of it almost as long in print has been, for some reason or another, hitherto overlooked and could have gone still unnoticed were it not for the challenge of the present papyrus. The most important data is provided by Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845) in his story of Adam and his several descendants. This account consists of long quotations from Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī, whose chain of authorities is, as already stated above, from his father, Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib, on the authority of Abū Šāliḥ (d. ca. 100?/718?)³ on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās (d. 68-70/687-89). Ṭabarī provides corroborative and supplementary evidence from Hishām with this same *isnād*. No one reading extensively in the Christian Arabic versions and in Hishām's materials as preserved in these two early Islāmic authors—Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarī—can have any doubt as to Hishām's full acquaintance with a written version of the tale on which he drew so freely. It is enough here to draw attention to the existence of marked similarity of theme, sequence, and phraseology between the two sets of texts—Christian and Islāmic.

One of the earliest known Christian Arabic texts of the story of Adam and his descendants was edited and translated by Margaret Dunlop Gibson under the title *Kitāb al-magāll* or *Book of the Rolls* from a paper manuscript copy which she dated, on paleographic evidence, to the ninth century.⁴

¹ *Fihrist*, p. 94. Flügel, following the meager clue of Ibn Taghrībirdī I 678, confused the man with Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī of Kūfah, who died in 228/843. Some of the earlier sources, too, seem to have fallen into the same error; see Khaṭīb VI 326-28; *Mizān* I 86 f.; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Lisān al-mizān* (Ḥaidarābād, 1329-31) I 354 f.

² In his review of Houtsma's edition in *ZDMG* XXXVIII (1884) 153-60. See also Albrecht Götze, “Die Nachwirkung der Schatzhöhle,” *ZS* III (1924) 60-71.

³ This is the client of Umm Hānī, a well known *tābi'ī*, whose death date seems to be nowhere given (cf. Ibn Sa'd V 222, VI 207; *Iṣābah* IV 202). Friedlaender mistook him for Abū Šāliḥ Dhakwān (d. 101/719), who, unlike the first Abū Šāliḥ, was never connected with transmission of materials to Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī (see Israel Friedlaender, *Die Chadhir-legende und der Alexanderroman* [Leipzig, 1913] and cf. pp. 50 ff. below).

⁴ *Apocrypha Arabica*, pp. vii-xi, 1-58 and Arabic pp. 1-56.

Some two decades earlier Carl Bezold had begun to edit and translate, under the title *Die Schatzhöhle* or *The Cave of Treasure*, a Syriac and an Arabic version of the tale from later manuscripts.¹ The extent to which Hishām is indebted to these texts is fully illustrated by comparison of the following passages: Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 12–16, together with Ṭabarī I 119 f., 122, 126 f., 132 f., 152 f., 163, 165, 170, find parallels in Gibson's Arabic pp. 5, 9–12, 17 and in Bezold's Vol. II 11, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 33, 35 (even-numbered pages contain the Syriac text). Some of the themes covered are Adam's Peak, the Cave of Treasure, which served also as the burial place for Adam and his righteous descendants, the birth of Abel and Cain and their twin sisters, the latter's names and comparative charms, the rivalry of the two brothers, and the murder of Abel. A second lengthy passage from Hishām is found in Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 16–18, which, together with Ṭabarī I 185, 188, 192 f., 195, 197, 199, 210, finds parallels in Gibson's pp. 20 f., 23, 25, 27, 29, 31 and Bezold's Vol. II 75, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 99, 101, 103, 117. The themes here are the life of Noah and his family on Adam's Peak and in the Cave of Treasure, the building of the Ark, the Flood, the final interment of Adam's body, and the new settlement of the Ark's passengers. The Islāmization of the tale at strategic points cannot escape the reader. It took place quite early in Islām, for Wahb's account² of the Cave of Treasure (*ghār al-kanz*) as Adam's burial place is already under its influence, as are also those of his younger contemporary Ibn Ishāq and others.³ It was to be expected, is quite naïve in spots, and need not detain us here.⁴

Is Hishām's *isnād*, tracing back to Ibn 'Abbās, to be accepted on its face value back to this earliest link? There is little reason to suspect Ibn 'Abbās' familiarity with Christian and Jewish as with Persian and Greek legends current in his day, particularly with those whose heroes appear in one form or another in the Qur'ān itself. Conceivably his interest in these characters would have been intensified as he progressed with his *Tafsīr* or commentary on the Qur'ān,⁵ even though the *Tafsīr* itself as it has come down to us throws no light on these legends, it being primarily linguistic. Abū Ṣāliḥ transmitted the *Tafsīr* to Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī, adding, it would seem, new materials of his own, since his *Tafsīr* is considered the longest and fullest of its kind.⁶ Muḥammad al-Kalbī in turn dictated his own *Tafsīr* to his public.⁷ His *Tafsīr* is believed lost, but extant extracts from it show that he included legends in it.⁸ Much as the orthodox traditionists looked askance at this chain of transmission,⁹ the *akhbārī*'s or those interested primarily in ancient history or legend drew freely on it, even as did 'Umārah ibn Zaid (see pp. 51 f.). Hishām himself reports that he received from his father the specific

¹ Cf. p. 41 above. More recently Alphonse Mingana has edited and translated under the title *The Apocalypse of Peter* a Garshūnī version of that portion of the *Book of the Rolls* that covers stories of New Testament characters (see "Woodbrooke Studies" III [Cambridge, 1931] 93–450). For an exhaustive bibliography on the *Schatzhöhle* see Georg Graf, *Geschichte der Christlichen arabischen Literatur* I (Città del Vaticano, 1944) 198–200.

² See *Ma'ārif*, p. 10. That Wahb was familiar with Syriac Christian legends current in the 7th–8th centuries, including still other materials to be found in the Bezold and Gibson texts, is indicated by comparison of Ṭabarī II 724–32 with existing Syriac and Christian Arabic texts (cf. Ugo Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici* [Città del Vaticano, 1952] pp. 96 f.; see also pp. 15, 20, 27, 69).

³ *Ma'ārif*, p. 9; cf. also Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-mu'ammārīn*, and Ibn 'Asākir V 142, both quoting Ibn Ishāq's *Mubtadā'*; Ṭabarī I 120 f.; 161–63; see also above, Comment for p. 2:9–12. On the other hand, some Islāmīc phrases seem to have crept into the Christian Arabic terminology; cf. e.g. Gibson, *Apocrypha Sinaitica* ("Studia Sinaitica" V [London,

1896]) p. 61 and *Apocrypha Arabica*, p. 20; Sūrah 9:112).

⁴ Ibn Sa'd, as his work demands, becomes less and less concerned with the stories of the prophets. Nevertheless, his Hishām materials (e.g. Ibn Sa'd I 1, pp. 18–27) offer other themes that present interesting parallels for comparison with Christian versions. For the Cave of Treasure in works of Ṭabarī and his successors see Götze in *ZS* III 153–77.

⁵ Cf. *GAL* I 190 and *S* I 331.

⁶ Ibn Sa'd VI 207; Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* (Cairo, 1318) II 189.

⁷ *Fihrist*, p. 95.

⁸ Cf. *GAL* *S* I 331 f. and p. 54 below. There are some *Tafsīr* manuscripts that are attributed to him, but their authenticity is not yet established (see *GAL* I 190 and references there cited). The printed edition (Bombay, 1302) is not available to me.

⁹ When to this chain was added the link of the younger Suddī, Muḥammad ibn Marwān, it was known as the "false chain" or the "chain of falsehood" (cf. Sam'ānī, folio 294b; Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-itqān* II 189; Goldziher, *Studien* II 247).

information about Adam's body (the first idol?) being buried in a cave on the hill named "Baudh" ("Naudh") in India (i.e., Ceylon), where Adam landed after the fall.¹ Here, then, is a highly probable starting point for a written Islāmic version of such legends, that is, at the latest in the first half of the eighth century. The prodigious Hishām, who claimed to have memorized the Qur'ān in three days and who, from his youth, was personally instructed by his father,² must have profited as much from such oral instruction as from his father's written materials. His great debt to his father is evidenced by the frequent use of this *isnād* and others that are headed by the latter, all of which appear sooner or later in many of Hishām's own works. He was thus in position to produce, along with his other works of astonishingly wide coverage, a book entitled *Kitāb ḥadīth Adam wa-wuldihi*,³ or *Book of the Narrative of Adam and His Descendants*, now believed lost. Ibn Sa'd, a younger contemporary of Hishām, whose materials he transmitted directly,⁴ undoubtedly drew on this work for his longer Hishām passages such as those cited above.

The eighth-century Kalbīs, father and son, with their written materials, make it possible to trace the development of Islāmicized Christian literature back at least a century earlier than has hitherto been recognized. The demonstrated close parallels between these Islāmicized versions and the known Christian Arabic texts throw back the beginning of the development of this Christian Arabic literature itself to about A.D. 700 at the latest. This is, in turn, a century earlier than has hitherto been suspected on the strength of the evidence of the earliest extant Christian Arabic manuscripts, particularly the Sinai manuscript of the *Book of the Rolls*.⁵ The very use of the term *majāll* suggests a seventh-century origin of this Arabic book. The singular, *majallah*, meaning a written sheet, roll, or book, was already fully Arabicized in pre-Islāmic times and was used by Nabighah al-Dhubaynī to indicate the Gospels. Muḥammad himself is said to have used it in referring to the *Book of Wisdom* of the legendary Luqmān, adding that "with the Arabs every *kitāb* is a *majallah*," a statement confirmed by the philologist Abū 'Ubaid al-Qāsim ibn Sallām (157-223/773-837). The only known use of the plural, *majāll*, in Islāmic circles is from the first century of the Hijrah. The well known Companion Anas ibn Mālik (d. 91 or 93/709 or 711) wrote down the sayings of Muḥammad and gave his written materials, *majāll*, probably booklets in loose sheets or rolls, to his numerous pupils to copy and to memorize.⁶ To judge from extant literature, the words *majallah* and *majāll* seem to have been rapidly superseded in the literary circles of the succeeding generations by the terms *ṣaḥīfah*, *maṣḥaf*, *daftar*, *kitāb* and their plural forms. It should be noted at this point that Götze's lengthy studies of the multilingual literature on the *Schatzhöhle* complex led him to suggest about A.D. 750 as the probable date of the first Arabic translation. Graf, however, still remained skeptical of any eighth-century Arabic translation of the work.⁷

This same Sinai manuscript contains several direct quotations and close references to the Psalms

¹ Hishām, *Kitāb al-aṣnām*, pp. 50 f.; see above, Comment for p. 2:9-12.

² Khaṭīb XIV 46; *Irshād* VII 251; Ibn Sa'd I 1, p. 27.

³ *Fihrist*, p. 96; *Irshād* VII 252.

⁴ The process, which does not mean oral transmission only, was reciprocal, since Hishām transmitted some of Ibn Sa'd's materials too (cf. Khaṭīb XIV 45; *Irshād* VII 250).

⁵ See Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica*, p. xi, where it is pointed out that this early manuscript gives internal evidence of having been copied from an unpointed Arabic text; cf. also Mingana, *op. cit.* p. 98. Malan, *The Book of Adam and Eve*, p. vi, suggests an 8th-century Arabic origin of this Christian work, which though definitely related to the *Book of the Rolls* and *The Cave of Treasure* is not to be confused with either (cf. Gibson, *op. cit.* p. vii; Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* I [Leipzig, 1883] x; Mingana, *op. cit.* pp. 94-96). Neither

are these versions to be identified with the Jewish and Semitic archetype *Life of Adam and Eve* (cf. Malan, *op. cit.* pp. iii f.; C. C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction* [New Haven and London, 1945] pp. 131 f.).

⁶ Ibn al-Athīr, *Al-nihāyah fī gharīb al-ḥadīth* (Cairo, 1311) I 173, IV 80; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'arab* (Bulāq, 1300-1307) XIII 127; see also Lane, art. "Jall," p. 438, col. 3. In modern times *majallah* is used for legal and other works, especially periodicals, of a high order.

⁷ Götze, *Die Schatzhöhle: Überlieferung und Quellen* (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, "Sitzungsberichte" XIII 4 [1922]) esp. p. 38, and his "Die Nachwirkung der Schatzhöhle," *ZS* II (1924) 51; Graf, *op. cit.* p. 198. E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Cave of Treasures* (London, 1927) p. 24, suggests a 7th-century Arabic translation but gives no reason for the opinion.

and the Gospels,¹ which would seem to indicate a ready availability of Arabic Biblical texts to eighth-century Christian authors. This is supported by further evidence from a second Sinai manuscript, containing several Arabic apocryphal texts.² Gibson was quite confused about the date of this paper manuscript copy, which at different times she dated A.D. 1233, 799, and 1175, the last presumably being correct.³ While the extant manuscript is certainly comparatively late, if for no other reason than its paleography, it is, nevertheless, a copy of an earlier Arabic text that was actually dated 183/799, and therefore it still serves, though indirectly, as manuscript evidence for eighth-century Biblical quotations.⁴ The evidence of still another early manuscript needs to be weighed here. It consists of four parchment leaves containing the Greek and Arabic texts of a few verses from Psalm 77, with the *Arabic text written in Greek characters*. Bruno Violet, who discovered and published this unique manuscript of Damascus, dated it, quite conservatively, late eighth or early ninth century.⁵ Bernhard Levin places such use of the Greek alphabet as far back as the sixth century.⁶ Quite obviously some Arabic-speaking Christians of the pre-Islamic and early Islamic periods were not willing to exclude Arabic from their religious life even when they either could not or would not yet use the Arabic script itself.

Arabic Biblical texts were likewise available, though not to the same degree, to Muslims of the seventh and eighth centuries. The scholarly 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ (d. 65 or 77/684 or 696), who probably did read Syriac, is reported to have "acquired a number of the books of the 'people of the Book' which he was accustomed to study and in which he found wonders."⁷ It is impossible to tell whether these were portions of the Scriptures proper or of some apocryphal texts in either Arabic or Syriac. Mālik ibn Dīnār (d. 130/748), Qur'ān copyist and bookseller (see p. 24, n. 5), not only read the Torah but frequently quoted the Bible in Arabic citations that have the ring of the Proverbs and the Psalms.⁸ A definite instance of Biblical citation is the long-recognized quotation from the Gospels by Ibn Ishāq (d. 152/769).⁹ Other eighth-century instances may come to light with discovery and

¹ Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica*, Arabic pp. 7 f., 21, 28, 30, 37; translation, pp. 8, 21, 28 f., 30, 39; cf. also Mingana, *op. cit.* pp. 103, 110, 123, 126 f., 131, *et passim*.

² Gibson, *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, ms. No. 445, esp. pp. 52 f., 55 f.

³ *Ibid.* pp. xiii f.; "Studia Sinaitica" XII (London, 1907) 21 and Pl. XI. Mingana (*op. cit.* p. 352) has followed Gibson's erroneous dating of 183/799.

⁴ The interlinguistic evidence of all the available early Christian Arabic texts has not received sufficient attention at the hands of Biblical scholars and Arabists. A good starting place would be the exhaustive study of Biblical quotations which appear in 8th- and 9th-century Arabic manuscripts, whose number is by no means limited to those mentioned above. Most of the undated manuscripts have been conservatively assigned to the 9th century as much on meager paleographic evidence as on the preconceived theory that the Christian communities of early Islamic times had little use for Arabic for their own religious and communal literature. For typical statements of this widely held theory see Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica*, p. xi, and Graf, *op. cit.* pp. 27-52. With our increased and increasing knowledge of Arabic manuscripts and paleography, Christian and Islamic, it is certainly feasible to suspect an 8th-century origin of some of Gibson's earliest manuscripts, especially the Acts and the Epistles published by her in "Studia Sinaitica" VII (1899); note esp. pp. vi-vii, ix, and the illustrations of the early angular Kūfic script. Ms.

B 4910

No. 514, recently rediscovered and christened "Codex Arabicus," promises to throw some light on early Christian Arabic literature; see Aziz Suryal Atiya, "The Arabic treasures of the Convent of Mount Sinai," *Proceedings of the Egyptian Society of Historical Studies* II (Cairo, 1953) 5-26, esp. pp. 22-26.

⁵ "Ein zweisprachiges Psalmfragment aus Damascus," *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung* IV (1901) cols. 384-403, 425-42, 475-88, esp. cols. 386, 430.

⁶ *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung* (Uppsala, 1938) p. 11.

⁷ Ibn Sa'd IV 2, p. 11, VII 2, p. 189; Dhahabī I 39.

⁸ Abū Nu'aim II 358 f. (also pp. 369 f., 382, 386, which indicate familiarity with some Gospel materials); Ṭurṭushī, *Sirāj al-mulūk* (Cairo, 1888) pp. 94 f. (part of which is reminiscent of Prov. 21:1) and 123. See p. 119 of the same work for citations from a *Book of Wisdom* by 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair (d. 94/712). For others of about this period who were said to have read the Torah and the Gospels, see Ibn Sa'd VII 1, p. 161; Abū Nu'aim II 45; Ṭurṭushī, *op. cit.* pp. 95, 120. The list could be extended, but the subject deserves a new and separate treatment starting with the time of Muḥammad.

⁹ *Sirah*, pp. 149 f. It is of interest to note that Ṭabarī's account of the life of Christ (Ṭabarī I 711-41) is drawn almost exclusively from Wahb and his nephew 'Abd al-Ṣamad ibn Ma'qil (pp. 724-28, 731, 735-37), Suddī (pp. 714-17, 732-35), Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib

study of early Arabic literary papyri and parchments. As it is, the evidence already on hand brings early and external support to the few literary references, in subsequent Islāmic and Christian sources, to Bible translation in the East and in Spain in the Umayyad period (A.D. 661–750) and reaching even beyond that time in the East to the reign of 'Umar I (634–44).¹ A definite answer to the still controversial question of whether or not Arabic Biblical texts were available to Muḥammad and his contemporaries or even to his immediate predecessors is not yet in sight.² Baumstark's strongest positive argument has been shaken of late by Vööbus. This argument rested heavily on the long-held conviction that the Old Syriac did not survive into Islāmic times. In as much as the earliest Islāmic Biblical quotations have linguistic affinities with the Old Syriac Bible, Baumstark concluded that the Islāmic sources drew on an ancient pre-Islāmic Arabic version of the Old Syriac. Vööbus' thesis, with its surprises for Baumstark, is that the Old Syriac *did* survive well into the Islāmic period and that the Islāmic quotations in question could easily have come from an eighth- or ninth-century Arabic translation. While this does not, in itself, disprove a pre-Islāmic Arabic translation of the Bible, in whole or in part, it certainly can no longer be used as the main argument to prove such a translation. Vööbus takes no note of this implication of his results and continues to assume a pre-Islāmic Arabic translation of at least the Gospels. On the other hand, Graf concedes no more than strictly local translations into Arabic of sundry portions of the Bible until at least as late as the ninth century.³

III

The Kalbī materials have some direct bearing on the history of yet another group of controversial early Arabic texts, namely, the *Romance of Alexander*. Though as far back as 1890 Nöldeke (see p. 55) suggested a probable Arabic translation from the Pahlavi by Ibn al-Muqaffa' (d. ca. 139 or 143/756 or 760), those most concerned with the history of the multilingual complex of this tale have stayed close to the ninth century as the period of the first literary Arabic version of the *Romance*. Friedlaender in his generally careful study, of which more presently, seems to favor the early ninth century on the grounds that 'Umārah ibn Zaid, author of a *Romance of Alexander*, lived in about the second half of the second century of the Hijrah (ca. A.D. 767–815).⁴ Later, Theodor Seif questioned even Friedlaender's ninth-century dating and argued for a tenth-century origin of a written Arabic version of the *Romance*. He based his argument on the belief that the distinctive motifs of Adam's Peak and the Cave of Treasure, which appear in the Arabic version on which Friedlaender based his dating, were not yet current in the Arabic literature of the ninth century and that, therefore, the Arabic *Romance*

al-Kalbī (p. 713), and Ibn Ishāq (pp. 712, 719–24, 738–40).

¹ F. Nau, "Un colloque du patriarche Jean avec l'émir des Agaréens," *Journal Asiatique*, 11. série, V (1915) 225–79, esp. pp. 232–35; Henri Lammens, "A propos d'un colloque entre le patriarche jacobite Jean I^{er} et 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣi," *Journal asiatique*, 11. série, XIII (1919) 97–110; A. Baumstark, "Eine frühislamische und eine vorislamische arabische Evangelienübersetzung aus dem Syrischen," *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti* (Roma, 1938) pp. 682–84; C. Peters, "Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zur Frage der arabischen Bibeltexte," *Rivista degli studi orientali* XX (1942) 129–43. The Spanish translator of the Sacred Scriptures into Arabic in ca. A.D. 724 is said to have been John, Bishop of Seville (see *Primera crónica general: Estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio* . . ., ed. Ramón Menéndez Pidal, I

[Madrid, 1906] 326; Hitti, *History of the Arabs* [5th ed.; New York, 1951] p. 516).

² Cf. e.g. Lammens, "Les Chrétiens à la Mecque à la veille de l'Hégire," *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* XIV (Le Caire, 1918) 191–230; Baumstark, "Das Problem eines vorislamischen Christlich-kirchlichen Schrifttums in arabischer Sprache," *Islamica* IV (1931) 562–75; Baumstark, "Neue orientalistische Probleme biblischer Textgeschichte," *ZDMG* LXXXIX (1935) 89–118; Thomas O'Shaughnessy, *The Koranic Concept of the Word of God* ("Biblica et Orientalia" XI [Roma, 1948]).

³ Arthur Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac* ("Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientaliū: Subsidia" III [Louvain, 1951]) pp. 6–9, 156–63; Graf, *op. cit.* pp. 27–52.

⁴ Friedlaender, *Die Chadhirlegende und der Alexanderroman*, p. 130.

itself could not have taken shape before the tenth century.¹ Even if one grants Seif's premise, his conclusion need not necessarily follow, since these motifs as such could have been introduced into the *Romance* at a later date than its first literary version. Neither is there any need to allow a century to elapse between the first currency of these motifs and their appearance in the *Romance of Alexander*, particularly in the first centuries of Islām with their rapid acceleration of literary and cultural activities. But Seif was mistaken even in his premise, for as already shown in the present study these two motifs were actually current in the Christian and Islāmic Arabic legendary life of Adam as far back as Ibn Ishāq and Wahb ibn Munabbih (see p. 47). Re-reading the *Tijān* with this particular problem in mind reveals the fact that though Wahb does not specifically link Adam's Peak and the Cave of Treasure with the adventures of Alexander,² he is nevertheless, in the *Tijān* itself, aware of the motif of burial in a Cave of Treasure, which he reports as the general practice for the burial of the kings of Ḥimyar.³ What these facts actually point to is the existence of at least Wahb's version along with sundry loose traditions as the bases of succeeding and fuller literary versions of the *Romance*. It will be shown presently that such versions took shape and were committed to writing not in the tenth or even in the ninth but in the eighth century.

Friedlaender, who has brought together extracts from the known extant Arabic versions of the *Romance*, considers that of 'Umārah ibn Zaid to have been the first literary version of the tale in its own right, apart from Wahb's Yemenite version as preserved in Ibn Hishām's recension of the *Tijān*. Unfortunately not much is known of 'Umārah and his literary activities. The usual earlier biographical sources, which are concerned largely with the transmitters of *ḥadīth* and *ta'rikh* proper, seem to have overlooked him almost completely.⁴ It is Mas'ūdī⁵ who gives us the first external clue to the man and his time. He reports 'Umārah as the friend of 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥfūz al-Balawī, whose tribe had long been settled in Egypt and who himself received some traditions from 'Umārah. 'Umārah in his turn received traditions from his father, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Zaid, who in turn transmitted some materials from Anas ibn Mālīk (d. 91 or 93/709 or 711)⁶. No death date is given for any of the three men, but it is quite obvious that they are men of the second century of the Hījah, though 'Abd Allāh and perhaps even 'Umārah may have crossed into the earlier part of the third century, that is, the first decade or so of the ninth century of our era.

The internal evidence, on the other hand, of 'Umārah's own account establishes him as a younger contemporary of Muqātil ibn Sulaimān (d. 150/767),⁷ whose *Tafsīr* or commentary on the Qur'ān has survived to this day.⁸ 'Umārah specifies, in his introduction, four main *isnād*'s or channels of information, though his text shows that he by no means limits himself to these.⁹ Friedlaender was unable to identify any of his immediate links, and these are still not too readily identifiable, except for Ishāq ibn Bishr, of whom more presently. Three of the four *isnād*'s trace back to Ibn 'Abbās, and one traces back to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110/642-728). Two of the *isnād*'s are of special interest. The first is Ismā'il ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān (= Suddī?) on the direct authority of Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-

¹ Seif, "Vom Alexanderroman," *Festschrift der Nationalbibliothek in Wien* (Wien, 1926) pp. 745-70, esp. pp. 760 f.

² These do, however, include expeditions to India and a pilgrimage to Mecca, while Alexander himself is presented as a Ḥimyarite king (*Tijān*, pp. 81-126, esp. pp. 85, 103, 105, 110).

³ *Ibid.* pp. 56, 59, 64, 65 f. Fritz Krenkow speculates on the entry of this non-Semitic motif into Arabic folklore (see "The two oldest books on Arabic folklore," *Islamic Culture* II 233).

⁴ Friedlaender (*op. cit.* pp. 129 f.) gives no external clue to his identity. Friedlaender mistakenly believed that 'Umārah and 'Umārah ibn Zaid of the text were two separate persons (see his p. 129, n. 4, but see also

his p. 150, n. 2).

⁵ Mas'ūdī I 12.

⁶ *Fihrist*, p. 193; quoted also in Tūsī, p. 194; *Mizān* II 71, No. 513, and 248, No. 194; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān al-mizān* III 338, No. 1392 (where 'Abd Allāh is reported as *ṣāhib riḥlat al-shāfi'i* [cf. *GAL* S I 304, No. 20]), and 416, No. 1631, IV 278, No. 790.

⁷ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 129 f., 139; *Mizān* III 196 f.

⁸ See *GAL* S I 332, Nos. 1-2 under his entry. Oriental Institute No. 17620 is an early papyrus fragment of one of Muqātil's *tafsīr* works and will be published in Vol. II of this series.

⁹ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 133 f., 151, 308 f.

Kalbī (d. 146/763) on the authority of Abū Šāliḥ on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās.¹ The last three links, it should be noted here, formed Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī’s chain for the story of Adam and Eve. The second *isnād* of interest is Ishāq ibn Bishr (d. 206/821) on the authority of Jubair(?) on the authority of Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Muzāḥim (d. 105/723–24) on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās. Ishāq ibn Bishr has already been suggested as a possible author of the present papyrus, since he is credited with a *Kitāb al-mubtadā’*.² Among his chief authorities are Muqātil ibn Sulaimān, Ibn Ishāq, Sa’id ibn Abī ‘Arūbah (d. 156/773), and Juwaibar ibn Sa’id (no death date available).³ Again, this Juwaibar is known to have drawn heavily on Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Muzāḥim.⁴ This leads one to suspect that the unidentified Jubair of ‘Umārah’s quite faulty text is an error for this Juwaibar ibn Sa’id. Sa’id ibn Abī ‘Arūbah forms ‘Umārah’s second link in the fourth main *isnād*, which traces back through Qatādah ibn Du‘amah (d. 117/735)⁵ to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. Qāsim ibn Nuṣair, the direct link in this *isnād*, is still unidentified.

Among ‘Umārah’s second links, other than those appearing in his four main *isnād*’s, are Ibn Ishāq and Sa’id ibn Bashīr (d. 168/784). This means that ‘Umārah, who is definitely known to have been a contemporary of Muqātil, was also contemporary with most of the second-link traditionists in his *isnād*’s, from some of whom he could have received, at times, materials directly, as would seem to have been the case particularly with Ibn Ishāq.⁶ Again, ‘Umārah himself, since he was old enough to question Muqātil, who died in 150/767, could hardly have survived beyond the second century of the Hijrah. Certainly he must already have been an old man with his active years behind him by about 200/815. Thus both the external and the internal evidence on ‘Umārah and his sources point much more to the late eighth than even the early ninth century as the period of his literary activity.

Friedlaender states further that he is not absolutely certain that ‘Umārah himself used written texts.⁷ Absolute certainty calls for the discovery of dated or datable manuscripts from the eighth century, which may or may not be found in the future. Nevertheless, ‘Umārah’s own account and direct testimony come as near to attesting his use of manuscripts as anyone fully familiar with the methods of early Islāmic scholarship can expect. Friedlaender not only failed to see this but actually altered the key sentence in ‘Umārah’s text that refers to earlier written sources on his very theme.

‘Umārah, in his introductory pages, comments on the numerous versions of the *Romance* and promises to select from these only the best and only those which accord with the Qur’ān. After stating that people (*nās*) differ on Alexander’s racial origin, his role as prophet or king, and the time of his rule, he ends with the sentence *وكلهم دون خبرا*, which Friedlaender edited to read *دون خبره*, “and all of them without knowledge.”⁸ Friedlaender thus saw in the obscure eighth-century ‘Umārah an astute critic and original scholar.⁹ This honor is unfortunately not justified by ‘Umārah’s literary product, which ultimately could do and did no better than to draw on some of the very same sources that Friedlaender would have ‘Umārah condemn. For there is no evidence whatsoever that ‘Umārah ever claimed to have discovered a unique and authentic source of information. Actually the Arabic sentence in question needs no editing at all if one reads the unvocalized second word not as a preposition but as a verb of the Second Form, *dawwana*,¹⁰ “to compose,” “to write down.” Translated as “and each of them composed a narrative (or history or story),” the sentence fits logically with the

¹ There is a bare possibility that the links in the *isnād* may have got out of order, in which case this Ismā’il ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān could be none other than Suddī (d. 127/744–45), who also transmitted from Abū Šāliḥ, as stated above (p. 45). In that case the *isnād* should trace back from Muḥammad al-Kalbī to Suddī to Abū Šāliḥ to Ibn ‘Abbās, for which order no parallel has so far been met with in this connection. Still, such an order is not at all improbable, considering that Muḥammad al-Kalbī was younger than Suddī and that both men are credited with a *Tafsīr* or Qur’ānic commentary.

² See p. 46 above; Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 134,

136, 140, 309, 315.

³ Khaṭīb VI 326–28.

⁴ *Ibid.* Vol. VII 250 f.; Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-itqān* II 189.

⁵ Cf. Dhahabī I 115 f.

⁶ Cf. Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 130, n. 2, and 150, n. 2, also pp. 83, 130 f., 150–53, 308.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 131.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 308.

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 131 f.

¹⁰ For use of the singular verb with *kulluhum* when the latter means not “all of them” collectively but “each of them” individually see Sūrah 19:95 and Carl Paul Caspari, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, trans. . . . and ed. . . . by William Wright . . . 3d ed. . . . II (Cambridge, 1898) 205 f.

basic meaning of the entire passage, in contrast to Friedlaender's amended reading, which renders it at odds with its context.

There are other statements in 'Umārah's text, though not quite so explicit as the one quoted above, that indicate the use of written records. He cites Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and his transmitter Qatādah in the following terms: *فيذكر قتاده في خبره*, "Qatādah mentions in his report," or *ذكر الحسن في خبره*, "Ḥasan mentioned in his report," or *رجعت الى خبر الحسن*, "I return (here) to the report of Ḥasan."¹ The verb *dhakara* does sometimes alternate with *qāla*, but there is early evidence that it was more specifically used in connection with reports, narratives, and books that had already been committed to writing or that were in the process of being written down. This is clearly brought out in the case of Ibn Ishāq's method of transmission. His trustworthiness was questioned, and he was accused of incorporating written materials into his own books. 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Madīnī (161-234/777-848), the famous traditionist and teacher of Bukhārī, came to Ibn Ishāq's defense on the ground that Ibn Ishāq specified the method of acquiring his materials, oral or otherwise, that is, written. "The trustworthiness of Ibn Ishāq", said he, "is quite apparent, since he transmits at times with '*ḥadathanī* Abū al-Zinād' and at times with '*dhakara* Abū al-Zinād.'" ² Again, *dhakara* was used as a cross-reference device in written works in the sense of *infra* or *supra*.³ *Dhakara* as used by 'Umārah need not necessarily imply that either Ḥasan or Qatādah left a written account of the story, though it does imply that the accounts which trace back to them⁴ had been committed to writing by the time of 'Umārah himself.

No doubt 'Umārah, among others (cf. p. 47), knew of the long-current written versions of the *Romance* in Greek, Persian, and Syriac. But he can hardly be referring to these non-Arabic non-Islāmic works, or even to oral versions of the same, as the sources for his "orthodox" record. The literary tradition he must follow is necessarily the Islāmic one starting with the Qur'ānic references to Dhū al-Qarnain,⁵ supplemented by the early Qur'ānic commentaries and orthodox traditions⁶ and elementary versions of the tale down to his own day. It is, therefore, hardly an accident that the great majority of 'Umārah's known authorities proved, on investigation, to be men who either wrote or transmitted a commentary on the Qur'ān.⁷ Muḥammad al-Kalbī's *Tafsīr* is definitely known to have contained episodes from the *Romance of Alexander*.⁸ Some of these men, like Muqātil ibn Sulaimān, were also *quṣṣāṣ* or storytellers. Some of 'Umārah's still unidentified sources no doubt belonged to this class, which as a group was beginning to be less highly esteemed⁹ than either the traditionists or

¹ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 131, 134, 149, 315. The subject of the verb could also be the feminine *qisṣah*, "story," and the sentence could then read, "The story returns (here) to the report of Ḥasan."

² Khaṭīb I 228 f. For biographical notices of 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Madīnī see Khaṭīb XI 458-73; Dhahabī II 15 f. Abū al-Zinād (d. 131/748) was not only an accomplished secretary but the leading traditionist and jurist of Medina (see Dhahabī I 126 f.). For other instances of this use of *dhakara* see *Sīrah*, pp. 3:2, 4, 15-16 and 4:2-7; Ṭabarī I 1095. Both authors refer in these instances to Ibn Ishāq, whose written materials were known to them though transmitted also orally.

³ E.g. in *Sīrah*, pp. 52, 54, 59, 95, 96; Ṭabarī I 1130, 1134, 1146.

⁴ Ḥasan seems to have collected considerable source material on the *Romance of Alexander* drawn from the heterogeneous and contradictory traditions current in his day. His materials were frequently transmitted through Qatādah and appear not only in 'Umārah's narrative but also in later versions of the tale (cf. Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 89 f., 119, 127, 130, 138, 140, 144, 177, 232). Both Qatādah and Ḥasan generally wrote

down their materials, and Ḥasan's books were sometimes borrowed for copying (see Ibn Sa'd VII 1, pp. 115 f., 126, VII 2, p. 2).

⁵ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 61-67; see also *ibid.* p. 181, 316 f., for the continued currency of this motivation.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 67-107.

⁷ Cf. Ibn Sa'd VI, pp. 210 f., VII 2, p. 33; *Fihrist*, pp. 33 f.; Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-itqān* II 189, from which it appears that lengthy accounts were frequently attributed to Ibn 'Abbās; and see *isnād* links discussed above.

⁸ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* p. 138; see above (p. 47) for legends in general.

⁹ The *quṣṣāṣ* have been, at times, categorically condemned by Muslim and non-Muslim authors. The condemnation is unjust to most of the early storytellers and to many who came later. The *quṣṣāṣ* of early times were generally reputable judges and traditionists who functioned as preachers and exhorters through the medium of the story—usually legendary and semi-legendary tales of the prophets and heroes of history. Johannes Pedersen has done this group more justice in his art. "The Islamic preacher," *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, Part I, ed. Samuel Löwinger and

even the historians and therefore received scant attention later from the biographers. Friedlaender is right in suggesting that the obscure 'Umārah himself belonged to this class. 'Umārah's account is titled *Qiṣṣat Iskandar Dhū al-Qarnain*, and *qiṣṣah*, "story," is the word he generally uses in referring to earlier versions of the tale.¹ His account is a simple narrative integrating, for the most part, his major sources as against a long string of short traditions received from numerous artless oral transmitters. In short, 'Umārah's selection of a few major *isnād*'s, his introductory comment on his sources, and the style of his own literary product point to the existence and use of written materials in addition to oral transmission.

Still another set of clues, this time external to the 'Umārah text, point to the same conclusion. Later versions of the *Romance* have two points in common with that of 'Umārah in respect to sources. Their authors, like 'Umārah, mention a number of well known traditionists and some comparatively obscure men. But, again like him, they draw heavily on one or more of the known early narrators who belong either to the generation of Wahb and Ḥasan al Basrī or to the following one of Muḥammad al-Kalbī, Muqātil ibn Sulaimān, and Ibn Ishāq. This is equally true be the version Shī'ite or Sunnite or be it from the eastern or western half of the Muslim world, such as the account of the well known Tha'labī (d. 427/1036) or the little known late Spanish version based on the Arabic account of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ziyād, a North African judge who died in 156/773.² These facts can only mean that in the period between Wahb and 'Umārah—roughly the first half of the second century of the Hijrah—professional commentators, judges, historians, and romancers were taking special interest in the *Romance* as such and that at least some of them, each according to his own purpose, composed either brief accounts to be included in larger works or full and separate narratives of the *Romance*. That Islāmic and non-Islāmic written Arabic sources on this theme actually existed in this period is confirmed in the brief account of Alexander as given by the Shī'ite Ibn Bābūyah (d. 381/991). Among his main authorities is one 'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaimān (fl. early second/early eighth century), "a reader of books," who specifically states that he read of Khaḍir and Dhū al-Qarnain "in the books of Allāh," *fī kutub Allāh*,³ a term that covered the Qur'ān as well as the Sacred Scriptures of the "people of the Book," that is, Jews, Christians, and, according to some, Magians. The books included the canonical and the apocryphal, which together were believed to have totaled 104 or even 163 books and booklets revealed by God to some 315 apostles sent to the different nations of the earth. Wahb claimed to have read 92 of these books, 72 of which were in his day in general circulation and readily accessible in places of worship (*kanā'īs*) and even by purchase.⁴ Even if one allows for great exaggeration in numbers, at least a few such books were available, even as the *Book of Adam and Eve*, as already seen above (p. 48, n. 5), was available. Wahb may have had direct or indirect access to some of the contents of the original non-Arabic works for some of his materials on the stories of the prophets which appear in the several later recensions of his books. 'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaimān, in the following generation, is, on the other hand, obviously quoting from Arabic and Islāmicized versions of such "books of Allāh" over and above the Qur'ān for the linking of Khaḍir and Alexander in the search for the Font of Life. Khaḍir was early established in Islām as a prophet;⁵ but the prophetic status of Alexander was subject to doubt and to discussion in Islāmic terms in these very "books of Allāh."⁶ The comparatively obscure 'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaimān and his interest in the records on Alexander may or may not have produced

Joseph Somogyi (Budapest, 1948) pp. 226–51, esp. pp. 231–45.

¹ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 249, 308 f. The biographers express, on the whole, adverse opinions on most of 'Umārah's authorities, including the well known authors Muḥammad al-Kalbī and Ibn Ishāq. It should be noted that among the chief reasons for their opinion are unfounded traditions, storytelling, poor memory, and the use of written sources acquired without the proper authorization.

² Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 162 ff., 174.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 126 f., 307.

⁴ See the writer's "An Arabic papyrus in the Oriental Institute," *JNES* V 174 f. and 178 and references there cited, esp. *Tījān*, p. 2, and Ibn Sa'd V 395 f. For the purchase of books for Wahb see Jawād 'Alī, *Ta'rikh al-'Arab qabl al-Islām* I 45; for the fabrication of "books of Allāh" by Jews for sale to Arabs see *ibid.* p. 226; *Sūrah* 2: 79 and *Tafsīr* I 286–88.

⁵ *Tījān*, p. 85; cf. Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 110, 243 f.

⁶ Friedlaender, *op. cit.* pp. 127, 307 f.

the first Islāmic literary version of the *Romance*. Nevertheless, his activities occurred in the period in which such versions were being produced.

Again, all of 'Umārah's identified authorities come from the imperial province of 'Irāq, which in his day challenged all others for scholarly and cultural leadership. Here were ample opportunities to draw on Persian, Jewish, and Christian legends.¹ Furthermore, 'Irāq early took a liberal view in permitting and practicing the writing down of Tradition itself, let alone history and legends. Here written texts were already the rule among the generation of Muḥammad al-Kalbī and Ibn Ishāq, whether or not the contents of the manuscripts were memorized by author or/and transmitter for subsequent oral and written transmission.² It is in this setting that 'Umārah's authorities, contemporary and immediately preceding, must have "each composed his own account," some brief and incidental, others devoted fully to an orthodox Islāmic version of the *Romance* in its own right, even as eventually 'Umārah himself wrote down his own *Qiṣṣat Iskandar*.

Apart from the great and widespread popularity of the oral *Romance* in pre-Islāmic times, and the steady motivation provided by traces of it in the Qur'ān and Qur'ānic commentaries, two trends probably contributed to its Arabic literalization by or in the first half of the eighth century. There was the romantic urge to locate the actual or supposed sites of Alexander's campaigns or adventures. Active interest in this was shown by the Umayyad prince and famous general Maslamah ibn 'Abd al-Malik (d. 122/740). As governor (91-114/710-32) of the provinces of North Mesopotamia (Jazīrah) and Azerbaijan, where some of these sites were located, Maslamah coveted the privilege and the experience of visiting and exploring at least two of them. These were Alexander's fortifications, *ribāt* or *sadd* (against Gog and Magog; Sūrah 18:91-97), and the Cave of Darkness (of the Seven Sleepers; Sūrah 18:5-20), said to have been visited by him. Maslamah reached the Cave but could not explore it, since no lamp or candle would burn long enough in the Cave to permit this.³ This royal interest, no doubt shared by others at Maslamah's court, may have spurred an aspiring student or storyteller to a new creative literary activity in connection with the *Romance*.

The second factor is the increased interest in foreign and non-Islāmic literature and the Arabic translations of some of this as evidenced in the works and translations of the Persian scribe and scholar Ibn al-Muqaffa', the translator of *Kalilah wa-Dimnah*. Either Ibn al-Muqaffa' or a contemporary Persian scholar translated, in 113/731, a remarkable work on Persian history and government for the Umayyad Caliph Hishām.⁴ Ibn al-Muqaffa's secretarial and scholarly activities continued into the reign of the 'Abbāsīd Manṣūr. The first of these won him that caliph's disfavor, but not before he had translated the Pahlavi *Khuday-nāmah* into the Arabic *Siyar mulūk al-'Ajam* or *Lives of the Kings of Persia*, which translation presumably included a life of Alexander with traces of the legendary romance as found in the Pahlavi. Unfortunately the Arabic translations or versions are lost to us,⁵ though they could not have been lost to the prominent translator's own generation of eager scholars, which included Ibn Ishāq, Muqātil, and Muḥammad al-Kalbī among others of 'Umārah's older contemporary authorities. Muḥammad al-Kalbī's *Tafsīr*, as stated above (p. 53), is definitely known to have contained extra-Qur'ānic legendary materials of the *Romance*. Whether Ibn al-Muqaffa' ever translated or composed a full Arabic version of the *Romance* as such cannot as yet be determined. Nevertheless, the results of the present study confirm and further strengthen Nöldeke's statement of long ago that either Ibn al-Muqaffa' himself or one of his contemporaries could have produced such a version.⁶

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 248 f. and references there cited.

² See below (pp. 91 ff.) for the specific and illustrative details of the oral and written transmission of Ibn Ishāq's works.

³ Muqaddasī, *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm* (BGA III [2d ed.]) pp. 136, 146. Royal interest in these sites was shown also by the Caliph Wāthiq (230-34/844-48); *ibid.* pp. 362-65.

⁴ *Tanbih*, pp. 106 f.; cf. Arthur John Arberry,

The Legacy of Persia (Oxford, 1953) pp. 62 f., 201 f.

⁵ *GAL* I 151 and *S I* 233-47; see also H. A. R. Gibb's art. "Ta'rikh" in *EI* Supplement, p. 234.

⁶ Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans* (K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Classe, "Denkschriften" XXXVIII 5 [Wien, 1890]) p. 34.

That written Arabic versions existed in Ibn al-Muqaffa's own day is now confirmed by 'Umārah's sources. Elementary as these may have been, they nevertheless marked the addition of the written to the oral accounts of the *Romance* that made possible 'Umārah's own composite narrative in the second half of the eighth century.

Friedlaender in his exhaustive study had much of the material here presented before him. In failing to see in it evidence of 'Umārah's written sources he was perhaps, like many others before him, unduly influenced by the still widely held theory that the Muslims' literary activity of this early period was largely oral, reflecting the practice in the transmission of *ḥadīth*. That the theory is not generally applicable to the second century of Islām is as amply proved by the very existence of some of this present group of historical papyri as by the present studies growing out of them.¹ Furthermore, the theory is no longer tenable, not even for *ḥadīth* itself, as the writer hopes to show in Volume II of this series, a study of a group of early *ḥadīth* papyri.

For the second time in a period of a few years the pioneer study of Arabic literary papyri has helped to give a truer perspective of the rapid cultural adaptation and evolution in early Islām than had hitherto been achieved. The much favored ninth century must yield to the comparatively obscure and much neglected eighth the first Arabic literary versions of the Syriac *Book of Adam and Eve*, the Greek *Romance of Alexander*, and the Pahlavi *Hazār afsānah*, better known under the titles *Thousand Nights* and *Arabian Nights*.²

The significance of these results for the early trends and development of Islāmic prose literature is indeed far-reaching. No longer can it be assumed that only the utilitarian and the scientific first claimed the attention of the early Muslims in their translations from Syriac, Greek, and Pahlavi. Biblical legends, historical romances, didactic and fantastic fiction kept pace with alchemy, astrology, and medicine, even before the 'Abbāsīd Manšūr (136–58/754–75) undertook a spectacular program of translations from the above-mentioned languages. Popular and anonymous for the most part, in the original as in the elementary Arabic versions, the literary output sprang from the inner need of the common man for imaginative fiction. The supply was on the scene in the Arab kingdom of the Umayyads. But, with the notable exception of Mu'āwīyah's patronage of 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah's historical legends, this class of literature went generally without the fanfare of state or royal sponsorship.

The over-all implications of the above results for the origins of Arabic prose literature, Christian or pagan, in the pre-Islāmic Near East must await the integration of definitive results of Biblical scholarship, of intensified researches in the cultural history of the early Oriental churches, and of an open-minded approach to the cultural life of the varied peoples and communities of pre-Islāmic Arabia itself.

¹ See esp. Document 6 of the present study (pp. 80–99).

² See the writer's "A ninth-century fragment of the 'Thousand Nights,'" *JNES* VIII 149–63.

3

EPISODES IN JEWISH HISTORY

Oriental Institute No. 17637. Second half of third/ninth century.

Medium brown papyrus fragment, much damaged, 22 × 10.5 cm. Reconstruction of recto 12 shows about half of the page and text lost. Narrow and uneven inner margins; 16 and 17 lines to the page.

Script.—Small mediocre cursive hand. Diacritical points are used in a few instances each with *bā'*, *tā'*, *thā'*, *nūn*, and *yā'*; *fā'* and *qāf* have a dot below and above respectively. A word is split at the end of verso 12. Note also the tendency to place an initial ligatured letter over a following *jīm* or its sister letters and see comments on the script of Document No. 5 (p. 65). The vowels *kasrah* and *dammah* are each used once, in the first word of recto 17.

TEXT

RECTO

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| [| النعمة ومجادات رب الا] | 1 |
| [| وعرضوا [ع]لى الله شر لا يعد لا لجا فيه من سطوات الا] | 2 |
| [| [و كا]ن منهم من ارتزق بكتابة ثمينة ومـ[نهم من | 3 |
| [| [و يقر]ون كتابه [وا]عطوا] | 4 |
| [| [ا]عطوا نورا من عند ربهم [ومـ[نهمـ]م | 5 |
| [| الصراطين] ومنـ[هم] | 6 |
| [| زاد حياتهم] [وحن عـ[ليهم | 7 |
| [| الى منازلهم فانقلبوا سرور] | 8 |
| [| فنظروا الى بالنصف المشتهم] | 9 |
| [| فاكلوا وشربوا ولبسوا حليتهم] | 10 |
| [| خالقهم الذى اذهب عنهم] الحزن | 11 |
| [| ثم ينكروا ما اعطاهم ربهم [ولم يقولوا الحمد لله الذى هدانا] | 12 |
| [| لهذا وما كنا لنهتدى لولا] ان هدانا الله | 13 |
| [| حينئذ انهم كانوا موـ[منين | 14 |
| [| ذلك نجا النجاف وهلك الكـ[افرون | 15 |
| [| ومن ظهورهم فاخـ[رجوا | 16 |
| [| ورسـموا على حراكيـ[لهم | 17 |

DOCUMENT 3

VERSO

[فهم منى ضريعون ثم خير ربهم-سم] ركين] 1
فان[ا ربهم خاضعهم فانهم يحرفون الكتاب] 2
[فانهم اعطوا كتابا ليعطوا ح[كمة]] 3
[راجيون منك [و]قروا بالعيو[ب]] 4
[فانهم عاد[و]ا وغار[و]ا كثيرا وسفلوا] 5
[] 6
ي[سـتغربون اذ قال عاتبهم فلا] 7
سعه او اصماتهم فلا يتكلمون] 8
يعا[تـ]ب[هم يوشذ ولا يسالون] 9
[حتى يوشنون بما كانوا يكذبون] 10
[فلا يكسبون مغلوين ولا] 11
[اهليتهم واموالهم مال فسا] 12
[معهم اغنيا انهم وان يحملوا] 13
اس[رائيل فخرجوا منها على ناحية] 14
س[قيا وعاتبوا رفاقهم] 15
[ويلهم وفاضت دموعهم] 16

TRANSLATION

RECTO

- 1 The grace and glory . . . Lord of the
- 2 And they wrought before God innumerable evil in which there is no refuge from the might of the Lord of the
- 3 [And there] were among them those who received the gift of precious writing and th[ose who
- 4 And they re]ad His Book and were given
- 5 And they were given light from their Lord. [And s]ome . . .
- 6 the two paths [. . . some of] them . . .
- 7 increased their life . . . and took pity [on them . . .]
- 8 to their houses and (their sorrow) turned to joy
- 9 They looked to Me for swift justice
- 10 They ate and drank and put on their adornment . . .
- 11 their Creator, Who removed from them [their sorrow . . .].
- 12 They deny their Lord's gifts [and they say not, "Praise be to God, Who has guided us]
- 13 to this though we were not such as to be guided had not [God guided us . . . ,"]
- 14 and We spared their lives, for they were be[lievers . . . and by reason of]
- 15 that the path was spared by the flood while (the) un[believers] perished . . .
- 16 from their backs. And they de[parted . . .]
- 17 and impressed on th[eir heads . . .]

VERSO

- 1 for they wander away from Me. (Even) then the goodness of their Lord is persevering
 2 [. . . . And] their Lord humbled them, for they change the Book
 3 . . . for they were given the Book so that they may be given wi[sdom].
 4 . . . hoping (for something) from you and acknowledged the(ir) faults
 5 They showed much enmity and deception and became base
 6
 7 [. . . . They] find it strange when he (Muḥammad) says, "Take them to task" and (they do) not
 8 . . . or their hardness and they speak not.
 9 [. . . He] will take them to task then, and they will not raise questions.
 10 . . . until they believe in that which they used to declare false
 11 . . . they will neither regain vanquished ones nor
 12 (will they) . . . their families. And their wealth is a wealth of corrup-
 13 [tion . . .]. Among them are rich ones. Indeed, if they carry
 14 [. . . Is]rael. They departed from it for the region of
 15 [. . . sor]rowful. And they took their companions to task
 16 . . . their wailing. And their tears gushed forth.

Comments.—Note the general condemnatory tone of the piece. The recto stresses the waywardness of the Jews and their ungratefulness to God, Who rescued them from Egypt, cleared a dry path for them across the Red Sea, and gave them, among other gifts, the Scriptures. In the verso, the reference is to the accusations made by Muḥammad that the Jews tampered with the Scriptures and showed enmity toward him. These are no doubt meant as background for and justification of Muḥammad's campaigns against the Jews and his expulsion of them from their settlements. Despite the heavy Qur'ānic flavor of the piece, only one direct quotation (recto 12–13) is identifiable. The rest seems to be vague recollections of shorter Qur'ānic phrases. The Qur'ānic references given below illustrate this and point to parallel Qur'ānic themes.

This type of literature increased with time among authors and storytellers and was widely spread by the third century of Islām. This circumstance and the fact that the papyrus offers no clues as to its authorship discourage attempts at specific author identification. Ṭabarī I 467–89 covers the story of Moses and the Exodus, with the longer narrative sections coming largely from Suddī and Ibn Ishāq. Kisā'i (*Kitāb qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*, ed. Isaac Eisenberg [Lugduni Batavorum, 1922–23] pp. 211–19) traces his version to that of Ka'ab al-Akhbār. Tha'labī (*Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*, pp. 110–13) gives a composite account of the Exodus story. Undoubtedly some of the materials in these accounts as well as some parts of the papyrus text trace back to the *Isrā'īliyyāt* of Wahb ibn Munabbih.

Recto 1–2. These lines are much damaged, the papyrus being worm-eaten and having peeled in spots. The reading is therefore partly conjectural. Note the paleographic combination of the letters *mīm*, *lām*, and *nūn* with the letter *jīm* in lines 1, 2, and 15 respectively.

Recto 3–7. A list of the gifts God bestowed on the children of Israel. See Sūrah 17:20 for God's readiness to bestow such gifts and Sūrahs 5:15, 45:16–17, 17:2–4 for the specific gift of Scriptures.

Recto 8–11. The children of Israel prepare for the Exodus. See Sūrahs 7:103–71, 10:75–93, 20:8–82 for the Exodus narrative. For some of the phrases of the papyrus text, see Sūrahs 84:7 and 10, 7:148, and 35:34 for lines 8, 10, and 12 respectively.

Recto 12–13. The author breaks the thread of the narrative to dwell on Israel's ungratefulness. The quotation is from Sūrah 7:43.

Recto 14–17. The story of the Exodus continued and the crossing of the Red Sea.

Verso 2–3. Both Jews and Christians are accused by Muslims of tampering with the Scriptures, though here the reference is to the Jews only (cf. Sūrahs 2:75, 4:46, 5:13–15; *Tafsīr* I 195–97; *EI* IV

669 f.). “Book” and “Wisdom” are frequently linked together in the Qur’ān, where they sometimes alternate for “Torah” and “Gospels” (e.g. Sūrahs 2:129 and 152, 3:48 and 164, 4:54 and 113, 5:110, 62:2; cf. *Tafsīr* I 415).

Verso 4–6. The Jews’ early expectations from Muḥammad and their later enmity toward him.

Verso 7–10. Note the transposition of *tāʾ* and *ghain* in the first word of line 7. The second last letter of the broken word of line 8 may be read as *fāʾ*, *qāf*, *ʾain*, or *ghain*. *Iṣmāt* may mean here “hardness of heart,” though it can also mean “being silent.”

Verso 11–16. These lines probably refer to the expulsion of the Banū Qainuqaʾ from Medina after the Battle of Badr (cf. *Sīrah*, pp. 545–47; Wāqidī, pp. 177 f. [= Wellhausen, pp. 92 f.]; Ṭabarī I 1359–63). The expulsion of the Banū al-Naḍīr is less possible here, since they left “with taberets and music” (cf. *Sīrah*, p. 653; Ṭabarī I 1452; see also Document 5 below).

4

THE *SIRAH* OF IBN HISHĀM
THE SECOND MEETING OF 'AQABAH

PERF No. 665. First half of third/ninth century.

Fine papyrus 11 × 13 cm. Central section of a folio covering 16 lines. Reconstruction of the text yields a rough estimate of 21 or 22 lines to the full page, with a text area of about 20 × 18 cm. This indicates a format slightly larger in width than in height.

Script.—Small well formed early cursive hand with marked angularity. Note especially the initial *alif* with its consistent bend to the right. The triangular head of the *mim* is particularly conspicuous in verso. Diacritical points or dots are sparingly used and only for the letters *tā'*, *thā'*, *dāl* with dot underneath (verso 4), *zain*, *nūn*, and *yā'*. Hitherto, this papyrus was believed to provide the earliest instance of the use of miniature letters to avoid misreading. This is no longer so, for the device is now seen to have been in use some half a century earlier, as evidenced in the script of document No. 5 in the present group. A small '*ain*' appears under the '*ain*' of 'Uwaim in recto 6. A small *hā'* is placed under the *hā'* of Uḥud in verso 7, 9, and 13. It is difficult to see how these help to avoid all possible confusion unless one assumes that a well accepted convention already existed among the local scribes of the period and that this convention consisted in placing miniature letters only under *hā'*, leaving the reader to judge by context in all other cases between its sister forms *khā'* and *jīm*. The device was later extended to *ṣād* and *ṭā'*. It should be noted further that the miniatures are used here only in connection with proper names, both place and personal. No vowels are indicated, and the *alif* of prolongation is frequently omitted. The scribe indulges in letter extensions (e.g. recto 5 and verso 7, 15). The long line in verso 6 is meant for overlining the sentence for emphasis. A sign in the form of an inverted heart, with or without a vertical line through the middle, is used for punctuation in recto 7 and verso 5–6, though in recto 7 it is almost a circle. This is, so far as is now known, the earliest use of this device instead of the older circle with or without a dot. Script and scribal devices point to the early third rather than the late second century. For further illustrative comments on the script and punctuation of this piece see Grohmann, *Allgemeine Einführung in die arabischen Papyri* ("Corpus papyrorum Raineri . . . III Series Arabica" I 1 [Wien, 1924]) pp. 72 f., and his *From the World of Arabic Papyri*, p. 86.

TEXT

RECTO

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | بدرًا [وقتل يوم احد شهيداً اميراً لرسول الله ويقال اميه بن البرك فيما] |
| 2 | قال ابن هشام قـ[ال ابن اسحاق ومعن بن عدى] |
| 3 | بن الجعد بن العجلان بن حا[رثة بن ضبيعة شهد بدرًا واحدا والخندق] |
| 4 | ومشاهد رسول الله كلها قتل [يوم اليمامة شهيدا في ايام] |
| 5 | ابى بكـ[ر الصـ[ديق] |
| 6 | وعويم بن ساعدة شهد بدرًا و[احدا والخندق فجميع من شهد العقبة] |
| 7 | مر. الاوس احدا عشر رجلا و[شهد من الخزرج بن حارثة بن ثعلبة] |
| 8 | بن عمرو بن عامر ثم من بنى [التجار] وهو تميم الله بن ثعلبة بن عمرو بن الخزرج] |
| 9 | ابو ايوب وهو خالد بن زيد بن [كليب بن ثعلبة بن عبد عوف بن غنم] |

DOCUMENT 4

- 10 بن مالك بن النجار شهد بدر [واحدًا والخندق والمشاهد كلها]
 11 ومات بارض الروم غازيا في [زمن معاوية]
 12 ومعاذ بن الحارث بن رفاعه بن [سواد بن مالك بن غنم بن مالك بن النجار]
 13 شهد بدر [واحدًا والخندق] والمشاهد كلها وهو ابن عفرأء
 14 واخوه معا [ذ بن الحارث شهد بدرًا وقتل به شهيدا وهو لعفرأء]
 15 [واخوه عوف بن الحارث شهد بدرًا وقتل به شهيدا وهو لعفرأء]
 16 ويقال رفاعه بن [لحارث بن سواد فيما قال ابن هشام وعمارة]

VERSO

- 1 [النجار شهد بدرًا وابو طلحة وهو زيد بن سهل بن الاسود بن]
 2 [حرام بن عمرو بن زيد مناة بن عدى بن عمرو بن مالـك بن النجار]
 3 [شهد بدرًا رجلان ومن بني مازن بن النجار قيس بن ابـى صعصعة بن زيد
 4 [ابن عوف بن] مبدول بن عمرو بن غنم بن مازن شهد بدر []
 5 [وكان على الساقة] يومئذ وعمرو بن عزية بن عمرو بن ثعلبة بن
 6 [عطيه بن مبدول بن] مازن فجميع من شهد العقبة من
 7 [بنى النجار احد عشر رجلا و] من بلحارث بن الخزرج سبعة نفر
 8 [سعد بن الربيع بن ابي زهير] بن مالك بن امرى القيس بن مالك بن ثعلبة
 9 [ابن كعب بن الخزرج بن الحارث] شهد بدرًا وقتل يوم احد شهيداً
 10 [وخارجة بن زيد بن ابي زهير بن مالك بن امرى القيس بن مالك بن ثعلبة بن كعب
 11 [ابن الخزرج بن الحارث شهد بدرًا وقتل] يوم احد شهيداً وعبد الله
 12 [ابن رواحة بن امرى القيس بن عمرو بن] امرى القيس بن مالك بن ثعلبة
 13 [ابن كعب بن الخزرج بن الحارث شهد بدرًا واحدًا والخندق ومشاهد
 14 [رسول الله كلها الا الفتحة وما بعده] وقتل يوم مائة شهيداً اميراً
 15 [لرسول الله عليه] لم وبشير بن سعد بن ثعلبة بن كعب
 16 [ابن الخزرج بن الحارث شهد بدرًا وعبد الله] زيد بن ثعلبة بن عبد ربه]

Comments.—There is not much to be gained by translating, or rather transliterating, this list of names. The parallel list is to be found in *Sirah*, pp. 305–13. Ibn Sa'd mentions all the names that occur in the papyrus fragment. These and the rest of the names in the long list of Ibn Hishām's printed text are readily identifiable in Ibn Sa'd through the Indexes. Therefore Ibn Sa'd will be cited in the comments that follow only for significant variants.

Recto 1. It is unfortunate that most of the line is lost, for a distinction is drawn in *Sirah*, p. 306, between the variants "Burak" and "Bark." The papyrus text may have indicated the correct vowel signs or may have stated in so many words the correct vowels needed.

Recto 2. Note the absence of a punctuation mark after "Hishām." Reconstruction calls for the extension of some letter(s) to fill the line space.

Recto 3. The printed text has "Ibn al-Jall," but see Wüstenfeld's comment in *Sirah* II 96; see also Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 35.

Recto 4–5. Note the absence of the blessing formula. Extension of letters is called for in the second half of both lines, as also in that of line 11. It is to be noted that most of the extensions in the papyrus occur in the names of leading personalities.

Recto 7–9. Note the subject notations in the margin: الخزرج بنى النجار ثعلبة.

Recto 14–15. The papyrus allows no room for the inclusion of the printed parenthetical phrase that it was Mu'awwidh who had killed Abū Jahl ibn Hishām ibn al-Mughīrah.

Recto 16. Rifā'ah's participation is disputed by Wāqidī, who names only the first three brothers (cf. Ibn Sa'd III 2, pp. 54 f.).

Verso 5–6. It is difficult to tell whether the two dots under يَوْمَئِذٍ are intended for a *yā'* in the place of a *hamzah* or whether they are meant for the *zain* and *nūn* of the proper name "Māzin" in the line below. I am inclined to accept the latter, since names seem to receive special attention from the scribe. On the other hand it is to be noted that the papyrus (verso 8, 10, and 12) has امرئ for the امرء of the printed text.

Verso 15. Note the use of the short formula of blessing on Muḥammad in contrast to its omission in recto 4 (cf. p. 92).

DATE AND SIGNIFICANCE

As already stated in connection with the script, the papyrus belongs in the first half of the third century. This naturally arouses curiosity as to whether it could be the author's autograph, which in turn leads to a re-examination of the fragmentary text. It was tempting to consider the first *qāla* of recto 2 as the beginning of a new sentence, especially since there is no punctuation mark after "Hishām," and to read "Ibn Hishām said (that) Ibn Ishāq said" etc. But the combination of these two names at the beginning of a sentence occurs nowhere else in the papyrus nor in the printed list supplying the parallels. Furthermore, reconstruction from the latter meets the space requirements of the papyrus. It was therefore seen that the absence of a punctuation mark after "Hishām" is a scribal oversight. The full sentence in recto 1–2 therefore reads: . . . ويقال . . . فيما قال ابن هشام, "And it is said, . . . according to what Ibn Hishām has said." After this, the reconstruction of recto 16 in accordance with the printed text, which repeats this phrase, became a simpler matter. Next it was noted that this telltale phrase occurs at the *end* of the materials coming from Ibn Hishām, whereas the latter's practice was to introduce his additions with the simple *qāla Ibn Hishām*. Sampling of the printed text revealed no other occurrence of the telltale phrase. The suspicion grew that the phrase indicates early rare interpolations in Ibn Hishām's text. Wüstenfeld's comments on interpolations confirmed this suspicion. He points to the single instance of the use of the variant فيما ذكر ابن هشام without, however, noting the two instances under discussion. The certainty that these phrases indicate interpolations definitely eliminates the possibility of the papyrus being Ibn Hishām's autograph copy.

The next logical possibility is that the papyrus comes from the circle of one of Ibn Hishām's pupils and transmitters. The best known of these are the three Barqī brothers 'Abd al-Raḥīm, Muḥammad, and Aḥmad.² Though all three transmitted Ibn Hishām's work, the first seems to be the one primarily responsible for the only version of his *Sīrah* that has come down to us. Comments by Muḥammad (d. 249/863) appear in some manuscript copies.³ Aḥmad, who was killed in an accident (270/884), seems to have been the youngest of the three brothers and is reported to have heard the *Sīrah* from 'Abd al-Raḥīm (death date unknown). It is not likely that Aḥmad was old enough to have heard and transmitted materials directly from Ibn Hishām himself, who died in 218/834. Aḥmad is reported to have transmitted the *Maghāzī* on the authority of ('an) Ibn Hishām, which in all probability means

¹ *Sīrah* II xl f., 118.

² Cf. Yāqūt I 574; Dhahabī II 134 f.; *Sīrah* II xl–xliv. Wüstenfeld has confused the relationship of the three brothers into one of father and two sons. The

family home was in Miṣr, but father and sons made frequent trading visits to Barqah and the sons were sometimes referred to as the Ibn al-Barqī brothers.

³ *Sīrah* II 153.

that he received it as part of the *Sirah* from his brother 'Abd al-Raḥīm. The collective evidence, so far, favors the time of the two older brothers but offers no basis for even a tentative choice between them and their circles as the most probable source of the codex copy represented by the present fragment.

The text itself is too fragmentary to throw any new light on the vexed question of the number of meetings at 'Aqabah.¹ It is, nevertheless, illustrative of the simple nature and limited extent of variants in the course of early transmission. The reconstruction as made from Wüstenfeld's edition of the *Sirah* shows the papyrus text to differ from the latter in four points: the omission at times of the formula of blessing; shorter genealogies in some instances; the order of listing the names of men from the same subtribal group; and the omission of some incidental biographical details. The order of listing the names may or may not have any significance. But the three other characteristics point to an earlier text of Ibn Hishām's version of the *Sirah* than any hitherto known. The papyrus thus affords us, at one and the same time, the earliest text fragment and the earliest extant manuscript fragment of the famous *Sirah*.

¹ See Mélamède, "The meetings at al-'Akaba," *Le monde oriental* XXVIII 17-58. This author in her treatment of the second meeting at 'Aqabah has limited herself in respect to Ibn Hishām to *Sirah*, pp. 286-90, thus overlooking the lengthy account and important list of pp. 305-13, from which list the reconstructed names supplementing the papyrus text are drawn. Her oversight led her to the erroneous statement that Ibn Hishām does not list the names of the 70 or more men involved (see her pp. 22 f. and 35). However, this oversight was in part overcome by the use of Balādhurī's lists, in the *Ansāb*, which stem from Ibn Hishām. The Balādhurī manuscripts are not available to me at present for textual comparison; for their location see *ibid.* p. 24 and *GAL S I* 216.

Mélamède's arguments in favor of only one meeting at 'Aqabah are not convincing, based as they are on

the theory that it was Muḥammad's followers who sought to cast him in Biblical roles. Rather, it was Muḥammad's much more fertile brain and adaptable personality that could have caused him to reach out, consciously or otherwise, for these roles. His followers may have added fancy frills to his words and deeds without, however, inventing the basic core of the latter. Besides, such momentous alliances as were involved could hardly have been negotiated in a single meeting. In the absence of a more convincing argument the benefit of a doubt is still with the sources and their claim of two treaty meetings (cf. Frants Buhl in *EI* I 227 f. and his *Das Leben Muhammads*, trans. H. H. Schaeder [Leipzig, 1930]). For an interesting slant on some of the details of these meetings see Watt, *Muhammad at Mecca*, pp. 146-48.

5

CAMPAIGNS OF MUḤAMMAD

PROBABLY FROM THE MAGHĀZĪ OF MA'MAR IBN RĀSHID

Oriental Institute No. 17635. Late second/eighth century.

Medium brown medium fine papyrus 26.5 × 21 cm., with 25–26 lines to the page. As most of the vertical margins are lost, the original format would seem to have been close to a square. The papyrus is much damaged by breaks, peeling, and mildew.

Script.—Fine carefully executed book hand (see p. 4). The small, generally rounded letters are clearly formed and written close together with little loss of space even between words. Many of the letters and even some of their parts are separately formed, the pen having been lifted frequently. The points of ligature show slight overlapping, extension of the verticals below the base line, and some slight unevenness in the horizontal base of the words. The old forms of separate *jīm* and its sister letters are seen in verso 14–15. The horizontal stroke of *dāl* has a little twist to the right which helps to distinguish it from the otherwise similarly formed though larger final *kāf*. Final reversed *yā'* is preferred in *fī* and *ilā*. Diacritical points are on the whole sparingly used and only for *bā'* and its sister letters, *dhāl*, *shīn*, *fā'* and *qāf*, *nūn*, and *yā'*, the second half of the verso being more favored in this respect. There are many instances of a letter written atop initial or medial *jīm* and its sister letters to give the elegant combinations ى, ڤ, ڤ, ڤ, ڤ, ڤ, ڤ, and ڤ, with the needed dots rarely used. A small *hā'* is placed below the *hā'* in the word *halfahum* of recto 8. So far as is now known this is probably the earliest evidence of the use of these devices, which have already been noted above in connection with the scripts of Documents 3 and 4. A circle is used for punctuation.

TEXT

The text consists of three distinct themes: "The Last Badr" (recto 1–18), "The Affair of Bi'r Ma'ūnah" (recto 18–verso 13), and "Muḥammad and the Banū al-Naḍīr" (verso 13–26).

RECTO

- 1 [هو الهلك] فاخبرهم نعيم بن مسعود الخبر فقال اياكم ان قد جمعوا لكم جموعا [وقد جاوكم]
- 2 [في داركم فاص] ابوكم يثبطهم وقال [فلا تصنعوا الباطل فقد خرج معهم اه]
- 3 [فقالوا توكلنا] على الله ورسوله وخرجوا ببضائهم فقالوا ان لقينا ابا سفيان فهذه حاجتنا
- 4 [وان لا فاذ] ان بعناهم بضائعنا وهم يخرجوا في كل عام فانطلقوا حتى اتوا موسم [بدر وباعوا]
- 5 [بضائعهم ولم يخر] ج ا [وسفيان ولا احد من اصحابه او غيرهم واقبل رجل من بنى ضمرة مخشي]
- 6 [ابن عمر] الضمري فقال والله ان كنا لقيناكم تالله لم يبق منكم احد فما اعملكم [ان تخرجوا]
- 7 [للقتال] فقال رسول الله لترفع والله الى عدونا [من] قريش ان لم يعملنا الا موعدا وعدناه لهم
- قال مخشي
- 8 [اجيت للقاء قريش] قال نعم وان شئت مع ذلك رددنا اليك والى قومك حلفهم ثم نجلدكم
- قال ان يبين حكاهم

- 9 [الله بيننا وبينكم فقال الضمري معاذ الله يا محمد كف الله ما عليكم نمسك بلحلفنا وسمع بذلك مَعْبَد الضمري]
- 10 [رجوع] قريش الى مكة وقال في ذلك الخزاعي شعرا ○
- 11 [قد جعلت ماء قديد موعدا ○ وما ضجنان لها ضهي الغد ○ قد نفرت من رفقتي] محمد ○ وعجوة من صوغها كالعنجدى ○
- 12 [تهوى على دين ايها الاتلدى ○ وقدم معبد الخزاعي الى] مكة فاستخبروه عن موسم بدر قال [ل]
- 13 [اقاموا بها ثمانية ايام وباعوا ما خرجوا به من التجرات فربحوا للدرهم در]هما بالموسم وتجرد بهم الضمري فقال []
- 14 [الكيد والنفقة لهم فقال رسول الله واستخلفوا من استطاعوا من حو]لهم من [
- 15 [الناس فقال]ال ضمري اني رسولك فخرج يشط قومه بما قل او كثر ولم يقبل من [ال]قوم احد [
- 16 [الى موسم] بدر فرجع رسول الله هو ومن استجاب [بفض]ل من تجارتهم ونعمة من الله صدا قال [وا]
- 17 [هم الذي نزل] فيهم الذين قالوا لهم الناس قد ج [مع]وا لكم فاختشوم فزادهم ايمانا وقالوا [حسبنا لله]
- 18 [ونعم الوكيل ○ وبعث رسول الله سر]ية ع [الى اصحاب بنى سليم واميرهم م]نذر بن عمرو [
- 19 [اخو بنى سا]عدة وصاروا حتى اذا كانوا ببعض الطرف بعثوا حرام بن ملحان [اخا بنى عدى الا]نصا [رى]
- 20 بكتاب رسول الله ليقرأ عليهم فلقية عامر بن ملك بن جعفر [ابو برأ ملاعب الاس]نة بحر [ة]
- 21 بكتاب رسول الله فلما اتاهم انتحل له عامر بن الطفيل فق [لتله فقال ما اقبل وحده]
- 22 فاتبعوا اثره حتى وجدوا القوم الا منذر بن عمرو فق [تلوه اجمعين فقالوا لمنذر ان شئت امناك فقال]
- 23 لن اقبل لكم امنا الا ان ترفقوني حتى مقتل حرام ثم بر [ى منى فامنوه ثم بروا اليه فقاتلهم حتى قتل]
- 24 [فذلك قول] رسول الله اعنق ليموت ○ وقتل من الا [نصار ممن استشهد في بئر]
- 25 [معونة من بنى] عمرو بن مالك بن اسحاق انس بن معاذ بن انس وابوش [شيخ أ]بى بن ثابت بن المنذر ومن بنى عمرو بن مبدول]

VERSO

- 1 [الحارث بن الصمة وسهل بن عا]مر بن سعد بن عمرو بن فهد والطفيل بن سعد بن [ومن بنى النجار حرام وسليمان ابنا ملحان]
- 2 [ومن بنى دينار بن النجار قط]بة بن عبد عمرو بن مسعود بن سعد بن عبد [د الاش]هل وارتث من بين القتلى كعب بن زيد
- 3 [ومن بنى ساعدة منذر بن عمرو] امير الجند ومن بنى زريق [معاذ] بن ماعص ومن بنى عمرو بن عوف عروة [بن اسماء]
- 4 [بن الصلت حليف لهم م]ن بنى سليم ○ فقال حسان بن ثابت فيها اجار ابو برآء عامر بن الطفيل حين . . .

- 5 [. . .] وقال في حرام بن ملحان وقتله اناشيد الا ابلغ ربيعة ذا ال[مس]اعى فما احدثت
- 6 [في ال]حدثان بعدى ○ ابوك ابو الفضل[ول] ابو برآء وخالك ماجد حك[م] بن سعد ○ بنلى ام البن[ين] الم يرعكم
- 7 [وانتم من ذوائب اهل نجد ○ تخفر عامر بابي برآء ليخفره وما خط[ا] كعمد ○ ويقال لم[ا] قدم]
- 8 [القوم] من سرية منذر بن عمرو خلفوا على سرحهم ثلثة[ة] يرعونها فاذا الطير يفر منهم سا[رعا] فقال رجل منهم]
- 9 [قتل] والله اصحابنا انا لنعلم ما كانوا فيه بنى عامر وبنى سليم وهم لهذى ولك[نى] والله لا ارجع]
- 10 [حتى ا]قاتل احد منهم اما انا فلا ارغب بنف[سى] عنهم فانطلق فقتل فاما الاخرين فاقبلا الى [المدينة فلما كانا]
- 11 [بقناة اقب]ل رجلا من بنى كلاب كفار قد سلما عند رسول الله وصلا الى رسول الله بعهد[هد] امن حين]
- 12 نزل احدا فلما ناما الكلابيين قتلاهما فلما اجيا اليه قال لهما عهد امن و[جوار لادينهما انتهى حديث]
- 13 [امر بئ]ر معونة ○ بسم الله ال[لرحمن الرحيم]م هذا كتاب حديث
- 14 [امر ر]سول الله حين خرج الى بنى النضير يستعينهم في امر الكلابيين وكان حديث[م] مجموع]
- 15 [فيما] اجوا فيه فخرج رسول الله في رجال من اصحابه الى بنى النضير ليستعينوهم في الك[لابيين] الذ[ين]
- 16 [كانا] س[لم]ا الى قريش حين نزلوا باحد فقال رسول الله فخصوهم على القتال وذلوهم[هم] الى الغفال
- 17 [فلما كا]مهم رسول الله في غفل الك[لابيين] قالوا اجلس يا ابا القاسم حتى تطعم ثم نوتيك بحاجتك
- 18 ونقوم ونشور ونصلح امرنا فيما يحق [لك] فجلس رسول الله ومن معه من الصحابة في ظل حا[ئط]
- 19 ينتظر[ن] بنى النضير ليروا امرهم فلما خ[لوا] قال ل[هم] الشيطان تأمروا بقتله قالوا لا تجدوه
- 20 اقرب [منه الساعة فانه ان قتل] يحق لكم كل ش[ئ] في داركم ويرفع عنكم البلاء قال رجل منهم
- 21 ان شئتم [اظهر على البيت] الذى هو تحته فدليت عليه حجر تقتله فاوحا الله اليه بما تأمروا به
- 22 من شا[ئ]نه فنهض رسول الله [من م]كانه كانه يريد ان يقضى حاجة وترك اصحابه مكانهم و[توجه]
- 23 [مسرعا الى المدينة] فلما [ة]رغوا وقضوا امرهم في محمد اتوا فجلسوا مع اصحابه
- 24 [فلما استلبه] اصحابه قاموا في طلبه فا[قبل] رجل من المدينة بعد ان نفذ عليهم فسألوه فقال لقيته عامدا
- 25 [المدينة] وندمت بنى النضير على ما صنعوا و[قالوا] لاصحابه عجل ابو القاسم قبل ان يطعم ويفتهم اسرنا في
- 26 [دية الكلابيين ○ فانصرف] اصحاب رسول الله فرجعوا ونزل القرآن على رسول الله اذ

TRANSLATION

RECTO

- 1 . . . it will be destruction. [And Nu'aim ibn Mas'ūd] [brought them] the information. He said, "Beware! They have assembled forces [and are coming to attack you]

- 2 on your own home grounds and to] destroy you," dissuading them and adding, ["So do not
commit this folly, for coming with them are the people of . . ."]
- 3 [But they said, "We rely] on God and His Messenger." So they set out with their trade goods
and said, "Should we meet Abū Sufyān, these [will serve for our provisions]."
- 4 [But if not, then] we will sell our goods to those (at the fair)." For they used to go (to the fair)
every year. So they went until they arrived at the annual trade fair of [Badr and sold
5 their goods]. But neither Abū Sufyān nor any of his companions nor anyone else came out (to
fight them). There came a man of the Banū Ḍam[rah, Makhshī
6 ibn 'Umar] al-Ḍamrī, who said, "By God, had we met you (in battle), I swear by God not one
of you would have remained! What made you [come out
7 to fight]?" The Messenger of God said, "We will, by God, arise quickly to meet our enemy of
the Quraish. For nothing made us to come forth except our promise to meet them [here (in
battle)." Makhshī said,
- 8 "Then you have come to fight the Quraish?" "Yes," said he (Muḥammad). "Nevertheless, if
you so desire, we will release you from your (own) oath and then fight you (too)." He said
(further), "So will be manifest the judg[ment of
9 God between us and you." Said al-Ḍamrī, "God forbid, O Muḥammad! May God avert (the
danger) which is upon you. We hold to our covenant." Ma'bad al-Kh[uzā'i heard of this
10 . . . and the return of the] Quraish to Mecca. So al-Kh[uzā'i] composed some verses about that:
11 (1) [She (Muḥammad's camel) has set the watering place of Qudaid for a meeting place. (2) She
will be reaching the watering place of Ḍajanān early tomorrow. (3) She breaks into the lead of
the dual company of] Muḥammad (4) and away from the fine raisin-like dates of Medina.
12 (5) [She advances with her rider against the inherited faith of her fathers. And Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i
returned to] Mecca. They asked him about the fair of Badr, and he [said,
- 13 "They (Muḥammad's party) tarried eight days and sold what they had brought with them of
merchandise and gained for each dirham a dir]ham at the fair." Then al-Ḍamrī approached
them alone and said, ". . .
14 . . . stratagems and provisions for them." And the Messenger of God said that they made sworn
covenants with as many as they could of the sur[rounding
15 tribes. And] al-Ḍamrī said, "Verily I am (now) your messenger." And he went about restraining
his people by means small or great. So there set out none of the [people
16 to the fair] of Badr. And the Messenger of God and those who had answered his summons
returned with profit from their trade and (with the) blessing of God in turning away (the
enemy). It is said that
17 [they are the ones] to whom [the (following) revelation refers]: "Those to whom the people
said, 'The people have collected (forces) against you, so fear them.' But this increased them in
faith and they said, 'We trust in God
18 [and (He is) the best of] Trustees.' " The Messenger of God sent a mission to the friends of the
Banū Sulaim. Their commander (was) Mundhir ibn 'Amr,
19 [the sworn brother from among the Banū Sā]idah. They proceeded until they were on some of
the outskirts. Then they sent Ḥarām ibn Milḥān, [sworn brother from among the Banū 'Adī,
al-An]ṣārī]
- 20 with a letter of the Messenger of Allāh to be read to them. 'Āmir ibn Mālīk ibn Ja'far Abū Barā',
the player with spears, met them at the Ḥarr[ah of the Banū Sulaim]
21 with (the) letter from the Messenger of God. When he (Ḥarām) reached them, 'Āmir ibn al-
Ṭufail descended on him and killed him. And he said, "He (Ḥarām) did not come alone."
22 So they followed his tracks until they found the company, except Mundhir ibn 'Amr, and they
kill[ed them all. Then they said to Mundhir, "If you wish, we will grant you safety." He
said,]

- 23 "I will not accept your (offer of) safety except for the period while you accompany me to the death site of Ḥarām; then you shall [be free of any obligation to me." So they granted him safety (for that period). Then they declared themselves free of any obligation to him, and he fought them until he was killed.
- 24 It is on that account that] the Messenger of God said, "He hastened that he might die." And there were killed of the [*anṣār* of those who were martyred at Bi'r
- 25 Ma'ūnah: of] the Banū 'Amr ibn Mālik ibn Ishāq, Anas ibn Mu'ādh ibn Anas and Abū Shai[kh ibn Thābit ibn al-Mundhir; and of the Banū 'Amr ibn Mabdhūl,]

VERSO

- 1 [al-Ḥārith ibn al-Ṣimmah and Sahl ibn 'Ā]mir ibn Sa'd ibn 'Amr ibn Fahd and al-Ṭufail ibn Sa'd ibn . . . ; [and of the Banū al-Najjār, Ḥarām and Su]laimān the two sons of [Milhān;
- 2 and of the Banū Dīnār ibn al-Najjār, Qu]ṭbah ibn 'Abd 'Amr ibn Mas'ūd ibn Sa'd ibn 'A[bd al-Ash]hal and Ka'b ibn Zaid was carried out wounded from among the dead;
- 3 [and of the Banū Sā'idah, Mundhir ibn 'Amr,] commander of the force; and of the Banū Zuraiq, [Mu'ādh] ibn Mā'is; and of the Banū 'Amr ibn 'Awf, 'Urwah [ibn Asmā'
- 4 ibn al-Ṣalt, a confederate of theirs] of the Banū Sulaim. Ḥassān ibn Thābit composed verses about it (Bi'r Ma'ūnah): Abū Barā' sought the help of 'Āmir ibn al-Ṭufail . . .
- 5 And he composed about Ḥa[rām ibn Milhān] and his death the following verses: (1) Verily I shall inform Rabī'ah, he of the high[est distinc]tions, of the event you caused
- 6 to happen (right) behind me. (2) A man of excellence is your (Rabī'ah's) father Abū Barā', and a noble man is your maternal uncle Ḥaka[m] ibn Sa'd. (3) So[ns of Umm al-Ba]nīn, surely you will make amends,
- 7 you who are among the noblest of the people of Najd. (4) 'Āmir's treacherous abandoning of Abū Barā' was intended to bring great shame upon him (Abū Barā'). And he (the latter) did not do wrong (to the men at Bi'r Ma'ūnah) intentionally. And it is said that when advancing
- 8 [the company] of Mundhir ibn 'Amr left three men behind to pasture their flock. When there appeared a bird (of prey) hastening to (its) mischief, said one of the men,
- 9 "By God, our companions [have been killed]! We certainly know how matters stood with the Banū 'Āmir and the Banū Sulaim, and they are (responsible) for this. But [I will not return, by God,
- 10 until I] have fought one of them. For as for me, I hold not my life so dear as to turn away from them." So he went and was killed. As for the other two, they proceeded to [Medina. When they reached
- 11 Qanāt, there ca]me two men of Kilāb, pagans who had surrendered to the Messenger of God. They had joined the Messenger of God on pro[mise of safety while
- 12 he camped at] Uḥud. When the two men of Kilāb slept, the (other) two killed them. When the latter came to him (Muḥammad) he said, "They had a promise of protection and [safe conduct. I will certainly indemnify (their tribe for) them." Here ends the narrative of
- 13 the affair of B]i'r Ma'ūnah. In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. This is the book of the narrative
- 14 [of the affair of the M]essenger of God when he went to the Banū al-Naḍīr seeking their aid in the matter of the two men of Kilāb. It is a narrative [collected
- 15 from that which] has been related concerning it. The Messenger of God and some of his Companions went to the Banū al-Naḍīr to ask their help for the two men of Kilāb who
- 16 [had] surrendered to the Quraish when they encamped at Uḥud. The Messenger of God said, "They (Banū al-Naḍīr) accepted them (Banū Kilāb) as allies for battle and (then) dishonored [them by] negligence."

- 17 And when the Messenger of God spoke to them about their negligence of the [two men] of Kilāb, they said, "Be seated, O Abū Qāsim, so you can be served with refreshments and then we will meet your request.
- 18 We will arise and take counsel and set aright our position in regard to what is justly due [you]." So the Messenger of God and those who were with him of his Companions sat in the shade of a w[all]
- 19 waiting for the Banū al-Naḍīr to see to their affair. When they (Banū al-Naḍīr) were alone, Satan said to them, "Plot his murder." Some said, "You will never (again) find him
- 20 [so close as he is at this (very) hour; and if he is killed], you will have the right to everything in your settlement and the calamity will have been lifted from you." One of their men said,
- 21 "If you wish, [I shall ascend to the roof of the house] overlooking the place where he sits and roll down a rock on him that will kill him." But God revealed to him what they plotted
- 22 concerning [him. So the Messenger] of God rose [from] his place as though he wished to perform a natural need and, leaving his Companions in their places, he [departed
- 23 in haste to Medina]. And when they (Banū al-Naḍīr) had finished (deliberating) and had arrived at their decision about Muḥammad, they came and sat down with his Companions.
- 24 [When his Companions thought he had stayed away too long, they rose to look for him.] Now there came a man from Medina and as he passed by them, they inquired of him (about Muḥammad). He said, "I met him headed
- 25 [for Medina." The Banū al-Naḍīr regretted what they had done and] they said to his Companions, "Abū Qāsim hastened away even before he could be served and come to know our decision about
- 26 [the indemnity of the two men of Kilāb." And] the Companions of the Messenger of God [left] and returned (to Medina). Then was revealed (of the) Qur'ān to the Messenger of God: "When"

Comments.—The papyrus text, either in its entirety or in any of its several episodes, is not identical with the early historical texts on hand. In the following notes the reference which comes closest to the papyrus text will be given first. Where possible, the earliest authority within each account will be indicated. It is to be noted, however, that Ibn Hishām, Wāqidī, and Ibn Sa'd generally combine their source materials into a single composite narrative. This makes it virtually impossible to assign much of the material to a specific earlier authority.

The campaign of Muḥammad which is described in recto 1–18 is known variously as the "Second" or "Last" or "Lesser Badr" to distinguish it from the major "Battle of Badr." It is also known as *Badr al-mi'ād* or *Badr al-mau'id*, the "Promised Badr," since the Quraish and Muḥammad had, after the Battle of Uḥud, promised to meet again in battle at Badr. But when the promised time arrived, Abū Sufyān, after a half-hearted start, retraced his steps to Mecca. And so there was no actual engagement of forces. For the sources, early and late, on this campaign see Caetani I 589.

The mission to Bi'r Ma'ūnah (recto 18–verso 13) was sent at the request of Abū Barā', chief of the Banū 'Āmir, who though himself not a Muslim wished his tribe in Najd to hear Muḥammad's message. Muḥammad was reluctant to risk the mission until Abū Barā' pledged him its safety. The pledge was not honored by the tribes who annihilated the mission. For the general sources see Caetani I 579 f.; see also Eduard Sachau, "Das Berliner Fragment des Mūsā Ibn 'Ukbah," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1904, 1. Halbband, pp. 454 f., 468.

The affair of Muḥammad and the Jewish tribe of the Banū al-Naḍīr (recto 13–26) is directly linked with the preceding episode and forms the background for Muḥammad's subsequent expulsion of the tribe from its settlement. For most of the sources see Caetani I 584–88. The papyrus text is, in spots, quite close to that of Wāqidī and Ibn Ishāq, as will be seen below. It is unfortunate that the author of the papyrus text does not list his authorities at the head of his own composite narrative.

Recto 1-3. Abū Sufyān is anxious to avoid the promised battle. He sends agents to Medina to scare Muḥammad and his followers into giving up the idea of an engagement. The speaker of line 1 is his agent Nu'aim ibn Mas'ūd, who later accepted Islām and spied out the situation for Muḥammad in connection with the Battle of the Trench. Wāqidi, p. 318 (= Wellhausen p. 168), forms the basis of the reconstruction (cf. Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 42, 49; Ṭabarī I 1459; *Iṣābah* IV 1171 f.).

Recto 3-5. The reconstruction of lines 3-4 is largely conjectural, but cf. Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 42; see also Maqdisī IV 164 f., for the annual fairs.

Recto 5-9. The episode of Makhshī ibn 'Umar al-Ḍamrī traces back to Ibn Ishāq (cf. *Sirah*, p. 666; Ṭabarī I 1458 f.). The covenant referred to is obviously a treaty of neutrality.

Recto 9-12. The Ṭabarī and *Sirah* references just cited give these verses on the authority of Ibn Ishāq; but the order of the verses differs from that of the papyrus text. Wellhausen (p. 169, n. 3) gives a German translation of the verses in still another order. Such nonfixity of the order of some verses is frequently met with in pre-Islāmic and early Islāmic poetry. It stems, in part, from the poet's desire to give a verse a more or less independent identity of its own within the loose framework of a long poem. Early oral transmission contributed its share to the disorder of verses. In the present instance it is impossible to determine with certainty which, if any, of three orders available is the original order of these verses.

There are two textual variants. The word *nfri* is voweled to read *nafartu* in Ṭabarī and Wāqidi and so made to apply to the poet as hastening away from Muḥammad and his Companions. In *Sirah* it is voweled *nafarat*, referring to Muḥammad's mount, which is the reading preferred here. The second variant is the replacement of *ṣaughihā* of the papyrus text with *Yathrib* in all the others.

Quda'id, close to Mecca, is seen by the poet as Muḥammad's destination, to be reached after he had passed Ḍajanān, which is close to Medina. There was a small mosque at Ḍajanān where Muḥammad stopped for prayers on the way back to Medina after some of his campaigns (see Yāqūt III 465, IV 42).

The poet's inspiration for these verses, according to the sources already cited, was the sight of the camel-mounted Muḥammad leading his company composed of both Meccan Fugitives and Medinan Helpers in this expedition against the Meccans and the traditional faith.

Sirah (pp. 666 f.) gives several other poems in honor of this event; cf. also Ḥassān ibn Thābit, *Diwān*, ed. Hartwig Hirschfeld ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial' Series" XIII [Leyden and London, 1910]) p. 19, No. XVI.

Recto 12-13. There seems to be some confusion about the identity of Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i of recto 9 and 12, who is so named in *Sirah*, p. 666, and Wāqidi, pp. 329 f., but who appears as Ma'bad ibn Abī Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i in *Sirah*, pp. 589 f., and Ṭabarī I 1458 (both via Ibn Ishāq). *Iṣābah* III 902 f., 905 f., points out that these were two separate individuals and that the latter was too young for the role at the time. This confusion extends also to the authorship and occasion of the verse (cf. Wellhausen, p. 169, n. 3).

Curiously enough the detail of Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i's return to Mecca with information about Muḥammad at Badr is confirmed not in the earlier sources to hand but in the seventeenth-century Ḥalabī's *Al-sirah al-Ḥalabiyah* (Cairo, 1329) II 291.

The text of Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 42 f., seems to fit well into the space available in the papyrus. If the reconstruction is correct, then it is Ma'bad who reports the one hundred per cent profit made by Muḥammad and his Companions (cf. Wellhausen, p. 168, for the rate of profit). Ṭabarī I 1460, quoting Ibn Ishāq, reports the figure at two hundred per cent, which is the figure accepted by later sources (e.g. Daḥlan, *Al-sirah al-Nabawiyah*, on margins of *Al-sirah al-Ḥalabiyah* II 106).

Recto 13-14. It is not clear that Ḍamrī is here addressing Muḥammad's party. He could just as well be addressing the Quraish after Muḥammad's return to Mecca, as Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i is doing. Ibn Sa'd, who does not mention Ḍamrī, speaks of the preparation of the Quraish for the coming Battle of the Trench in the terms of line 14 (see Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 43).

Recto 14-16. The statement that Muḥammad made new allies at this time is not found in any of

the early sources cited. Neither is this second episode, involving Makhshī ibn 'Umar al-Ḍamrī and Muḥammad. It is to be noted that Ḍamrī's boastful yet cautious approach of recto 5–6 has changed to one of active co-operation.

Recto 16–18. Cf. Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 43; Wāqidi, p. 318. The Qur'ānic quotations are from Sūrah 3:172–74. Here again there are differences of opinion as to the occasion on which these verses were first revealed. Cf. Bell I 62, who following some of the sources, places these verses immediately after the Battle of Uhud. This would not prevent Muḥammad from using them again on this occasion.

Recto 18–21. The brotherhood referred to here is the Bond of Brotherhood that was established by Muḥammad between the Helpers of Medina and the Fugitives from Mecca (cf. Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 100; *Sirah*, pp. 344–46). Later sources misread احد, "one of," for اخو, "the brother of" (cf. Ibn 'Asākir VII 197). A dot over the first letter of "Ḥarām" could be meant for the second letter to give the reading "Ḥizām," common among the Quraish. The sources, however, give the name as "Ḥarām," common among the *anṣār* (see Dhahabī, *Mushtabih*, ed. P. de Jong [Lugduni Batavorum, 1881] p. 153; *Sirah*, p. 648, and Ṭabarī I 1442, both drawing on Ibn Ishāq; Wāqidi, p. 338 [= Wellhausen, p. 153]; Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 37). For biographical notice on Mundhir see Ibn Sa'd III 2, pp. 100 f., 145 f.; *Iṣābah* III 945. For Ḥarām see Ibn Sa'd III 2, pp. 71 f.; Bukhārī III 91–93, coming mostly from Ḥarām's nephew Anas ibn Mālik; *Iṣābah* I 654. For Abū Barā' see Ibn 'Asākir VII 195–99, which covers the affair of Bi'r Ma'ūnah as well. Abū Barā' was so humiliated because his pledge was not honored that he drank himself to death and became known as one of three who so ended their lives (cf. Ibn Qutaibah, *Kitāb al-shi'r wa-al shu'arā'*, ed. M. J. de Goeje [Lugduni Batavorum, 1904] pp. 50 f., 192, 224).

Recto 21–24. The reconstructions involved in these lines are based largely on Wāqidi, pp. 338 f., and to a lesser extent on Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 37. Cf. *Sirah*, pp. 345, 649; Ṭabarī I 1442; *Iṣābah* III 945 f. All draw heavily on Ibn Ishāq for these episodes. The papyrus text of line 22 implies that Mundhir came on the scene of battle only *after* all of his company were killed. Wāqidi's text (p. 339) expressly states that Mundhir was with his men and fought until only he was left alive. This suggests that phrases of the text which originally read وجدوا القوم فقتلوهم اجمعين إلا المنذر بن عمرو were transposed by the scribe of the papyrus when he made the copy. The phrase اعنق ليموت of line 24 appears in Wāqidi and is explained by Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 37, as meaning that Mundhir knowingly hastened to his death (cf. Lane, art. عنق, p. 2175). The variant المنعق ليموت appears in all the other sources cited. For 'Āmir ibn al-Ṭufail and his subsequent ambitious proposals to share or succeed to Muḥammad's power, see Wāqidi, p. 342; Ibn Sa'd I 2, p. 51; *Aghānī* XV 137.

Recto 24–verso 4. The reconstruction of this list of the slain is made with the aid of the only other list available, which is preserved in Wāqidi, pp. 343 f. (= Wellhausen p. 156). The two lists are not identical in the number of men involved, in the length of the genealogies, or in the order of the names. The shorter papyrus text is definitely the earlier of the two, as will be shown presently. Sources and critics have long differed on the number of men that were originally sent on the mission. The question will be discussed below.

Anas ibn Mu'ādh (recto 25) is the same as Wāqidi's Anas ibn Mu'āwiyah, whose full genealogy is given in Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 63. The reconstruction "Quṭbah" (verso 2) against Wāqidi's "Aṭīyah" is based on Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 75, and VIII, p. 321, whence comes also the completion of the genealogy. Ka'b ibn Zaid recovered but was killed later in the Battle of the Trench (cf. Wāqidi, p. 344; Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 50). The reading "Zuraiq" (verso 3) against Wāqidi's "Raziq" follows Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 129. For 'Urwah's full name see Wāqidi, p. 378; Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 89.

Verso 4–7. The verses of Ḥassān ibn Thābit, himself of the *anṣār* or Helpers, are the ones most frequently quoted in the sources in connection with this mission. His published *Diwān*, however, has only one group of verses on the theme. This group is reproduced in the *Sirah* (p. 651) but does not appear in the papyrus text. On the other hand, the one verse of lines 4–5 has so far not been found in the sources. The couplets of lines 5–7 on Ḥarām are found in *Sirah*, pp. 650 f., and Ṭabarī I 1445,

but in a different order (see also Wellhausen, p. 156, n. 3). Ibn 'Asākīr VII 199 reproduces these verses in the order of the papyrus text, but it is not possible to tell from his composite account whom he is quoting, though on the whole he draws heavily on Ibn Ishāq and Wāqidī. See Comments on recto 9–12 for differences in the order of verses. Notable textual variants are the use of أبو الخروب by Ibn Hishām and Ṭabarī as against the أبو الفضول of Ibn 'Asākīr and verse 2 of papyrus text. All three sources use تهكم, “derided,” “mocked,” instead of the تفخر of verse 4 of the papyrus text.

As the poet had intended, his verses stirred Rabi'ah to avenge the insult to his aged father by an open attempt on the life of his treacherous cousin 'Āmir ibn al-Ṭufail, who was bound to honor Abū Barā's promise of safe conduct to Muḥammad's mission (cf. *Sīrah*, pp. 650 f.). Other sources credit Muḥammad too with instigating Rabi'ah to this action and hint that Rabi'ah himself ended his days as a Muslim (cf. Wāqidī, p. 342; Ibn 'Asākīr VII 198 f.; *Iṣābah* II 1048 f., No. 2618).

Other poets, too, are sometimes quoted on Bi'r Ma'unah (see e.g. Wāqidī, p. 344; *Sīrah*, p. 651; Ṭabarī I 1445 f.; *Naqā'id Jarir wa-al-Akhṭal*, ed. Anton Saḥnānī [Beirut, 1922] p. 144).

Verso 7–10. The different versions of the episode of some of the men pasturing the flock and becoming alarmed at the sight of the bird of prey seem all to trace back to Ibn Ishāq. They either quote him specifically (e.g. *Sīrah*, p. 649; Ṭabarī I 1443) or use his materials, as evidenced by terminology, in a composite narrative (Wāqidī, p. 339; Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 41). The number of those in charge of the flock varies from two to four. Though most of the accounts name but two, the identity of only one of them seems unquestioned, namely that of 'Amr ibn Umayyah al-Ḍamrī. 'Amr's companion is variously given as Ḥārith or 'Urwah of the list of the slain (see Wāqidī, pp. 339, 343). A third version names him as Mundhir ibn Muḥammad al-Anṣārī (see Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 41; *Sīrah*, p. 649; Ṭabarī I 1443 f.). Still another version names the Quraishite Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqās (see Wāqidī, p. 342 [= Wellhausen, p. 156]). In versions where the number is more than two, as in the papyrus text, the men are not named (see Wāqidī, p. 379). Though the papyrus text is quite close, in parts, to these versions, it is not in its entirety collatable with any of them.

Verso 10–12. Most of the sources name 'Amr ibn Umayyah as the lone fugitive responsible for the death of the two men of Kilāb. This is in agreement with the many versions that allow 'Amr but one companion in the preceding episode. Since that companion chose to remain, fight, and die, 'Amr alone was left to hasten toward Medina, meet and kill the two men in revenge for his slain companions, and take the news to Muḥammad (see Wāqidī, pp. 342, 354 [= Wellhausen, pp. 156, 160]; Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 37 f.; *Sīrah*, pp. 649 f.; Ṭabarī I 1444, 1448; *Iṣābah* II 1245 f.). For Qanāt, one of three valleys around Medina, see Yāqūt IV 181 f. The reconstruction of lines 11–12 takes into account the related text of verso 15–16. The detail that the two men had approached Muḥammad for protection at Uhud is not found in the early sources.

Verso 12–13. Muḥammad's determination to pay the blood money is recorded in most of the sources already cited. The rest of the reconstruction given seems most in keeping with the tone of the piece and with the new heading that follows. It is possible, however, with a little crowding to reconstruct the passage to read (mainly with Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 39) *ووجد رسول الله على اصحاب بئر معونه*. For Muḥammad's anger, grief, formal mourning, and prayer for the slain of Bi'r Ma'unah and invocation against their murderers, see Wāqidī, pp. 340 f.; Bukhārī III 88–94; Ibn Ḥanbal III 111, 196, 235.

Verso 13–15. Note the extension of the *th* in *ḥadīth* in both line 13 and line 14. For similar full subject heading see Bukhārī III 71.

Verso 15–17. The introductory sentence of the account points to Ibn Ishāq's version; cf. *Sīrah*, p. 652, and Ṭabarī I 1448 f., both drawing heavily on Ibn Ishāq for the plot of the Jews to murder Muḥammad by crushing him under a rock to be thrown or rolled from the roof of one of their dwellings (see verso 21 of papyrus text). Wāqidī does not name Ibn Ishāq in his list of sources for the affair of the Banū al-Naḍir. Nevertheless his text shows familiarity with Ibn Ishāq's version, which must therefore be included among the “unnamed” sources Wāqidī mentions in passing (see Wāqidī, pp.

353 f. [= Wellhausen, pp. 160 f.]). The Quraish of line 16 must be, in view of verso 11–12 and the Comments thereon, the Quraishites in Muḥammad's own camp and not the entire tribe as such. Muḥammad's remark at end of line 16 refers to the alliance between the Banū Kilāb and the Banū al-Naḍir and the latter's reluctance to share in the indemnity of the two that were slain.

Verso 17–21. The reference to Satan does not appear in the sources, which generally specify instead the names of the Jewish leaders who are said to have counseled the plot. For close parallels to the argument of lines 19–20 see Wāqidī, p. 355 (= Wellhausen, p. 161); *Sirah*, pp. 392 and 652; Ṭabarī I 1449 on the authority of Ibn Ishāq. Wāqidī, who does not specify Ibn Ishāq in his list of sources at this point, has quite obviously drawn on him too. Wāqidī's composite account is fuller than the others as it is also more detailed than the papyrus text. He names the leaders of the Banū al-Naḍir and dwells on the advantages they expected to reap as the result of the murder of Muḥammad; namely, his followers would disband, the Quraish would return to Mecca, and the Jews would be left undisturbed in their alliance with the Aws and the Khazraj.

Verso 21–23. The warning that God sent Muḥammad and the latter's hasty departure are reported in most of the sources, though the phrases differ; cf. Wāqidī, p. 355, who uses words and short phrases similar to those of the papyrus text and who is the source of Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 41, and of Ṭabarī I 1450.

Verso 23–25. Here again the papyrus text reflects mainly Ibn Ishāq's version of the episode (cf. *Sirah*, pp. 652 f.; Ṭabarī I 1449; Wāqidī, p. 357). Wāqidī reports (p. 355) a second version, from which the reconstruction for line 25 is drawn. This version omits any reference to the man coming from Medina (cf. also Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 41; Ṭabarī I 1449 f.). Note the reference in line 23 and in recto 9 to Muḥammad as such as against the Prophet or the Messenger of Allāh. The formula invoking God's blessing on Muḥammad is missing throughout the folio.

Verso 26. The Qur'ānic reference is to Sūrah 5:11: 'When a people meditated stretching out their hands against you and He restrained their hands from you' (cf. Bell I 95; Maqdisī IV 213 f.). Sūrah 59, *Al-ḥaṣhr*, "The Roundup," is generally associated with the subsequent expulsion of the tribe (cf. Wāqidī, p. 361; *Sirah*, p. 654; Bukhārī III 72; Bell II 568–71).

AUTHOR, DATE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

The collective evidence yielded by the search for thematic and textual parallels, as already indicated in the "Comments," can point to only one conclusion, namely that the papyrus text represents in the *maghāzī* or campaign literature a line of transmission other than those that have come down to us. The question now is: Can the author and the line of transmission of the original papyrus codex be determined from the evidence on hand? To expect definitive positive identification would be too optimistic under the circumstances. Nevertheless, it is possible by a process of elimination to arrive at a well considered scientific guess as to the most probable author and line of transmission of the work. The final proof or disproof of this guess will have to await future generations of scholars.

For convenience of treatment the process of elimination will be applied to three significant periods in the history of *maghāzī* literature. The first period culminates with the *Sirah* of Ibn Ishāq (d. 152/769), the second with the *Maghāzī* of Wāqidī (130–207/747–822), and the third period covers roughly the first half of the third century of Islām or the first half of the ninth century of our era. Paleography and historiography confine the papyrus to within these periods. Furthermore, the fine quality of the papyrus and the excellent execution of the script point to a highly prized *mubaiyaḍah* or fair copy of a well received authoritative *maghāzī* work. This means that the author is to be sought among the *imām*'s or expert authorities in the campaign literature of these periods.

The starting point, for our purpose, is the work of Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741) and that of his three famous pupils: Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah (d. 141/758), Ibn Ishāq, and Ma'mar ibn Rāshid (96–154/714–71). Zuhri himself played no small role in emphasizing and extending the use of the *isnād* in the *ḥadīth* literature of his day. That he used the *isnād* in connection with his *Maghāzī* is evidenced in extracts or abstracts of the *Maghāzī* of his pupil Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah, who came to be known as *imām al-maghāzī* or leading expert on Muḥammad's campaigns.¹ It is therefore highly improbable that a text originating with Zuhri would fail to indicate sources at least at the heads of new themes or sections such as our verso 13–14. These same extracts or abstracts, which have come down to us in an eighth-/fourteenth-century manuscript, help to eliminate Mūsā as the author of the papyrus text. They include a version of his account of Bi'r Ma'ūnah as received from Zuhri and his authorities² and so afford an opportunity for direct comparison. The account is brief and lacks several of the themes of the papyrus text, with which, furthermore, it has little stylistic affinity.³ As for Ibn Ishāq, it has already been shown that the papyrus text is not collatable with any of the extant materials from his work, despite its evident dependence on either Ibn Ishāq's original works or on a source common to him and the author of the papyrus. Nor is it possible to consider the papyrus as perhaps representing the original and now lost *Maghāzī* of Ibn Ishāq, for it is known that he dated both the Last Badr and Bi'r Ma'ūnah,⁴ neither of which is dated in the papyrus text. This leaves the last of Zuhri's famous pupils, Ma'mar ibn Rāshid, as the one possibility from this period.

The two outstanding *maghāzī* experts of the second period under consideration are Abū Ma'shar (d. 170/786 or 787) and Wāqidī. Abū Ma'shar's work is believed lost except for brief extracts quoted by subsequent authors or some materials worked into composite accounts.⁵ This affords little opportunity for direct comparison. However, Abū Ma'shar is known to have used the *isnād* for most of his materials,⁶ a fact which in turn definitely eliminates him as the author of the papyrus text, since this has no *isnād*. What has been said already of Ibn Ishāq holds equally true for Wāqidī, with this added significant fact: The papyrus themes and phraseology come closest to Wāqidī's text at points where Wāqidī is drawing heavily on Ibn Ishāq. Wāqidī does not specifically indicate in his *Maghāzī* his indebtedness to Ibn Ishāq; but Ṭabarī's lengthy extracts from the latter firmly establish Wāqidī's debt.⁷ This suggests as a likely author or transmitter of the papyrus text a contemporary of Wāqidī who had access to Ibn Ishāq or to his materials, which in turn opens up two possibilities. The first is the independent *maghāzī* work of 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr (d. 130 or 135/747 or 752), as transmitted by his nephew 'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad (d. 176/792),⁸ of which no direct trace seems to be left, though brief passages were used by both Ibn Ishāq⁹ and Wāqidī.¹⁰ None of these passages is relevant to the papyrus text, not even those which occur in connection with Bi'r Ma'ūnah. The second possibility is the *Maghāzī* of the above-mentioned Ma'mar as transmitted by his pupil 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām.

The third period under consideration produced one presumably independent *Maghāzī*, namely the lost work of 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Madā'inī (135–215 or 225 or 231/753–830 or 840 or 845, with preference given to 225/840). This work could hardly have been particularly informative, original, or authoritative. For though known to have survived for a time, it is rarely quoted in connection with the campaigns. This is in marked contrast to this author's often quoted *Ta'rikh* or history of the caliphs.¹¹ At any rate, both Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarī have completely ignored Madā'inī's *Maghāzī* so far as the themes of the papyrus are concerned. For the rest of this period one is limited to liberally edited

¹ See *GAL* S I 204.

² See p. 70 above; cf. Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 164–67.

³ The extracts do not include a list of the slain, though Mūsā was given to making lists; see Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 166.

⁴ *Ṣīrah*, pp. 648, 660; by contrast, it is Ibn Hishām who supplies the date for the affair of the Banū al-

Naḍir (*ibid.* p. 653).

⁵ See *GAL* S I 207.

⁶ Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 498.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 518 f.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 25–28, 33.

⁹ Ṭabarī I 1442, 1452; Ibn Ishāq was a pupil of this 'Abd Allāh.

¹⁰ See Wellhausen, *Index*.

¹¹ *Fihrist*, p. 101; cf. *GAL* I 140 f. and *EI* III 81 f.

versions or transmissions of parts of the earlier works only, namely to Ibn Hishām's (d. 218/833) version of the *Sirah* of Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Sa'd's (168–230/784–845) transmission of extracts from the *Maghāzī* of Wāqidī. To these may be added Ṭabari's long and faithful extracts from both Ibn Ishāq and Wāqidī. As already indicated in the "Comments," the papyrus is not identifiable with works of any of these three, in either text or style. It is related closely to Ibn Ishāq and to a lesser degree to Wāqidī and has brief episodes and some details not found in what is available, directly or indirectly, of either author.

This process of elimination forces one to fall back once more on Ma'mar ibn Rāshid, whose *Maghāzī* could hold the explanation to the close affinities of the papyrus text first to Ibn Ishāq and second to Wāqidī. Ma'mar and Ibn Ishāq as copupils of Zuhri would have had much of the latter's material in common. Furthermore, Ma'mar could have had access to Ibn Ishāq's works during the latter's lifetime or during the few years that Ma'mar outlived him. For these works were in use at the time in 'Irāq, where Ma'mar visited repeatedly though he had by then settled in the Yemen.¹ Of Ma'mar's pupils only the Yemenite 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām (126–211/743–826), who studied with him for seven years, is credited with a work on *maghāzī*.² Yet 'Abd al-Razzāq's role does not seem to have been more than that of a transmitter of Ma'mar's material, since he is rarely cited in any of the sources and even then seldom in any capacity other than that of transmitter. Wāqidī does not mention him at all, not even when drawing heavily on Ma'mar, who is definitely a major source for Wāqidī³ and whom he cites in connection with his composite account of the themes which occur also in the papyrus text.⁴ Stylistic textual details which seem to point to Ma'mar and his times are the omission of the formula of blessing and the reference to Muḥammad by name (see verso 23 and Comment thereon). 'Abd al-Razzāq, also in keeping with the trends of his times, was a stickler for the use of the formula of blessing, particularly in oral transmission.⁵ Were the script of the papyrus more archaic, the codex it represents could be considered in connection with Ma'mar's original *Maghāzī* or with a contemporary or nearly contemporary copy of the same. But the script can be no earlier than the later part of the second century. Its careful execution leads one to suggest, under the circumstances, that it is very likely to be a fragment of 'Abd al-Razzāq's own prized fair copy of his master's *Maghāzī*. A second possible source is Wāqidī's own library, where two scribes were kept busy making copies of available source materials for Wāqidī's own selective and comparatively critical works.⁶ Be that as it may, the results of the negative process of elimination together with those of the positive though indirect evidence of the sources combined with those of the papyrus text itself point to Ma'mar ibn Rāshid as the most probable author of the *maghāzī* work represented by the papyrus.

II

What is the significance of this, the earliest extant manuscript fragment of the *maghāzī* literature? Again, not too much is to be expected from a fragmentary folio that is neither the first nor the last of a codex. Nevertheless, it is possible with the aid of this papyrus to clarify some controversies long associated with some of its themes, to find new evidence of Muḥammad's known ability to win friends and influence people, and to illustrate from this contemporary document some phases of Islāmic historiography of the second/eighth century.

The expedition to Bi'r Ma'ūnah has given rise to two controversies. These relate to the number and the tribal composition of those that participated in the expedition. Ibn Ishāq gives the number as

¹ For Ma'mar see *Fihrist*, p. 94; Nawawī, pp. 569 f.; Dhahabī I 178 f.; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 167.

² *Fihrist*, p. 228; Dhahabī I 332; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 168 f.

³ See Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 498–518 for Wāqidī's sources.

⁴ Wāqidī, pp. 337, 354; Wellhausen, pp. 153, 160, 167.

⁵ Cf. *Mizān* II 127. For the history and variations of the formula of blessing on Muḥammad see p. 92 below.

⁶ See n. 4 and *Fihrist*, p. 98; cf. Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 514 f.

forty.¹ Wāqidi reports that some place the figure at forty and others at seventy, but adds that he considers the first more correct.² Post-Wāqidi sources report both figures, with an increasing tendency to accept seventy, Wāqidi's position notwithstanding. Ṭabarī reports both figures but expresses no opinion of his own. With such authorities as Ibn Ḥanbal, Muslim, and Bukhārī reporting the figure as seventy, that figure became readily and widely accepted.³ Wāqidi lists sixteen slain. Ibn Sa'd does not reproduce the list as such, but with the aid of the Index to his work it is possible to reconstruct Wāqidi's list except for Sahl ibn 'Āmir and Ṭufail ibn Sa'd. Ibn Sa'd, furthermore, questions two of Wāqidi's entries, Mālik and Sufyān the sons of Thābit, of whom he can find no trace except in "Wāqidi's book on the martyrs of Bi'r Ma'unah."⁴ No such title is mentioned in any of the known lists of Wāqidi's works, and it is doubtful whether the *kitāb* in question was more than notes that formed the basis of Wāqidi's final list, where the names of these two obscure brothers seem to be a later entry placed at the end. The papyrus list does not include the two brothers and is, therefore, in accord with Ibn Sa'd's statement. On the other hand, Ibn Sa'd introduces two names not found in either Wāqidi or the papyrus list—Ḍaḥḥāk ibn 'Abd 'Amr and Mas'ūd ibn Sa'd—adding, furthermore, that the latter is said to have fallen not at Bi'r Ma'unah but at Khaibar.⁵ The list of the dead is thus twenty at the most. Yet all but one of the company's forty or seventy that started out are said to have fallen on the field.

How is one to account for this better than fifty per cent discrepancy between the list of the dead and the number of the original company even at the conservative figure of forty? The simplest answer would be to dismiss it as one more example of a well known and widespread phenomenon, namely that relayed numbers tend to grow and multiply with time. That, in the present case, would be oversimplification. Qur'ānic and Biblical usage gave the number seventy and its multiples by ten a wide and privileged currency in early Islām, as the third-/ninth-century Ibn Qutaibah points out.⁶ When it was not to be taken literally the number seventy was meant to convey to the Arabs the idea of "a great number," as Ibn Khaldūn realized.⁷ If "a great number" actually set out on the expedition to Bi'r Ma'unah, it would have to be over rather than under twenty. An interesting clue to the likely number is the earliest known term applied to this group, namely, *raht*,⁸ as found in the extracts from Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah. When applied to a non-family group the term indicates a company of *ten to forty* men. This meaning may explain how the number forty came at first to be associated with Bi'r Ma'unah. There is yet a third factor to be considered, namely, Wāqidi's own reconciliation of his list of sixteen slain with his acceptance of forty as the original number of the group. Wāqidi definitely implies that his list of the fallen is incomplete, for he concludes that list with the statement: "The total of the martyred men *whose names have been preserved* (italics mine) is sixteen."⁹ In view of all this, Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb's (d. 245/860) statement and that of Ḥalabī (source not given)¹⁰ that the number was said by some to be thirty would seem to be closer to the truth than either the seventy of the sources or Wāqidi's brief list of the slain, which Caetani seems to prefer.

Another approach to this problem of numbers would be to consider the special nature of the mission to Bi'r Ma'unah and the character of its members. This was not a military expedition but a proselytizing mission to a large confederation of tribes in the prosperous and coveted Najd. Its members had sufficient reason to expect safe conduct should the mission fail. That they were largely religious zealots

¹ *Sīrah*, p. 648; Ṭabarī I 1442.

² Wāqidi, pp. 338, 343; Wellhausen, p. 156; Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 71, IV 2, p. 31; Ṭabarī I 1447.

³ Ibn Ḥanbal III 111, 196; Bukhārī III 91; Suhailī, *Kitāb al-rauḍ al-'unuf al-bāsim* (Cairo, 1914) II 174; Ibn 'Asākir VII 196 f.

⁴ Ibn Sa'd IV 2, p. 85.

⁵ Ibn Sa'd III 2, pp. 75, 130.

⁶ *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, pp. 79, 97. For other early engagements in which 70 are said to have fallen, see Wellhausen, p. 153, n. 1.

⁷ *Muqaddamah* (Bulāq, 1274) p. 51. See also Moritz Steinschneider, "Die kanonische Zahl der Muhammedanischen Secten und die Symbolik der Zahl 70-73," *ZDMG* IV (1850) 145-70; Oscar Rescher "Über Zahlensprüche in Boḥārī," *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* I (1922) 203-12, esp. pp. 210 f.

⁸ *Iṣābah* III 945 f. This work names authors who transmitted the affair of Bi'r Ma'unah at length.

⁹ Wāqidi, p. 344.

¹⁰ Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, p. 118; *Al-sīrah al-Ḥalabīyah* III 194.

is, under the circumstances, readily understandable. The sources refer to them as being among the best of the Muslims, Qur'ān-reciters and pious ascetics from the group known as *ahl al-ṣuffah*, "people of the bench." The latter were largely a group of impoverished unknowns whom Muḥammad is said to have called the "guests of Islam."¹ Thus it is not surprising that the names of only some of the eager and humble missionaries were remembered. Perhaps, then, all that is needed is to edit Wāqidī's fixed "forty" to "about forty."

The second controversial point associated with this expedition is whether or not it included any Quraishites among its members. Ibn Ishāq, drawing on Hishām ibn 'Urwah among others, mentions two Quraishites. The extracts from Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah, quoting Zuhri, side-step the question, which may be due to the choice of the extractor rather than to Mūsā himself. Wāqidī reports, in composite accounts, both sides of the controversy but throws his own weight against the presence of any Quraishites (though the list *he* gives includes three of those). The papyrus text specifies only *anṣār* of Medina, and in as much as it gives the only other list of the slain found outside of Wāqidī, it is very probable that the papyrus list formed the basis of Wāqidī's own conclusions in this matter. At any rate, it presents eloquent support for his position and illustrates his critical approach to his sources. For, when the outstanding names and fantastic incidents associated with some of the three or four Quraishites mentioned in the sources are considered in their entirety, the result points to early invention.²

The papyrus text contains a number of new and pertinent details to which reference has already been made in the "Comments." Two of these in the account of the Last Badr provide particularly interesting illustration of Muḥammad's ability quickly to appraise and exploit the psychological factor in human relations. This ability enabled him to change Makhshī ibn 'Umar al-Ḍamrī from an unfriendly neutral to a willing agent for his cause (recto 6 and 15). Abū Sufyān's failure to appear for the promised engagement reflected adversely on himself and the Quraish at the same time that it raised Muḥammad's own prestige. Muḥammad seized this opportune moment to secure new allies by treaty.

The author of the papyrus codex not only shares materials with Ibn Ishāq but displays some characteristics of the latter's historical method (see pp. 9, 20). Like Ibn Ishāq he combines several reports into a single composite narrative and employs poetry for added color. Both can be too brief and general where detailed specifics are called for. This is readily seen by comparing their accounts with that of Wāqidī³ relative to the development of the rift between Muḥammad and the Banū al-Naḍir. It is more difficult to compare their treatment of dates and chronological order, since Ibn Hishām has reorganized and supplemented Ibn Ishāq's *Sīrah* and the available papyrus text is inconclusive for this purpose. For the papyrus, as stated above, does not date any of the three themes, two of which are dated by Ibn Ishāq. This need not mean that the papyrus author consistently neglected dates, since all three themes fall in the fourth year⁴ of the Hijrah and a statement to that effect may have preceded the extant part of the papyrus text. This possibility suggests that the author of the papyrus does not use chronological order as the main basis of his work but displays instead a causal organization by grouping two or more related themes together or by treating them consecutively. It must be noted that, in contrast to the chronological order of the sources, he places the Last Badr first instead of last in the order of his themes. This, in the over-all picture, could mean but one thing, namely that his account of this Badr follows that of the Battle of Uḥud, with which it was causally linked, as the affair of the Banū al-Naḍir follows that of Bi'r Ma'unah, with which it was similarly linked.

¹ Wāqidī, pp. 337 f.; Ibn Sa'd III 2, p. 71; Maqdisi IV 211. For *ahl al-ṣuffah* see Ibn Ḥanbal II 515; Abū Nu'aim I 123 f., 337-47; EI I 185.

² Cf. Wāqidī, pp. 342 f. (= Wellhausen, p. 156); *Sīrah*, p. 650; Ṭabarī I 1442-44. Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb (*Kitāb al-muḥabbar*, p. 118) says the group included four Meccan Fugitives.

³ Wāqidī, p. 357; Ṭabarī I 1449 f.

⁴ Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah erroneously dated the Last Badr in the year 3. Though all the others place it in the year 4, there is some disagreement as to the month in which it took place. This, however, does not affect the relative order of the several themes involved (cf. Wellhausen, p. 167, n. 2, and Ḥalabī, *Sīrah* II 296 f.; Caetani I 575, 598 f.).

The above-mentioned facts and observations in their cumulative results, tangible and suggestive, lend great weight to a long-standing suspicion. This is that Ibn Ishāq's *Maghāzī* was not superior, in content or method, to those of his fellow pupils and contemporaries and that, in the one as in the others, the guiding genius in this branch of early second-century Islāmic historiography was none other than their common master, Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-Zuhrī.¹ Ibn Ishāq's greater fame and longer survival are due to a combination of other factors that will be touched upon in connection with Document No. 6.

¹ For a summary of his works and method see Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 49 f.

6

THE *TA'RĪKH AL-KHULAFĀ'* OF IBN ISHĀQ
THE ASSASSINATION OF 'UMAR I AND THE APPOINTMENT
OF THE ELECTIVE COUNCIL

Oriental Institute No. 17636. About 150-75/767-91.

Medium brown medium quality papyrus, measuring 25.5 × 20.5 cm.; 17 lines to the page. The margins are comparatively narrow, with parts of side margins lost. Papyrus and text are on the whole fairly well preserved.

Script.—Small book hand inclined to be a little angular (see p. 4). Despite the apparent cursiveness, the ligatures show excessive pen-lifting within words. Though carefully executed and for the most part readily legible, the script has little claim to calligraphic artistry. In keeping with quite early common practice, words are sometimes divided at the ends of lines (recto 11, 14 and verso 3); it is to be noted that the first of these divided words is "Allāh." This practice may have originated in an effort to save space at a time when writing materials were scarce and expensive for students. Be that as it may, the present scribe is quite space conscious, as seen from the size of the script, the running of several themes together on the same line, and the comparatively narrow page margins. Diacritical points are quite rare. They are used once only for *fā'* (recto 14), twice for *nūn* (recto 15 and verso 5), and three times for final *yā'*—twice placed inside the letter (recto 14 and verso 5) and once below it (verso 10). Final *alif* and *yā' maqṣūrah* interchange frequently (recto 16 and verso 4, 8, 13). The circle is used to separate the themes, as well as for punctuation within the themes. The marginal notations are in the same ink and hand as the text.

TEXT

RECTO

كل خط عليه طلبت فقد وقع

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم |
| 2 | قال محمد بن اسحاق لما طعن عمر ابو لؤلؤة غلام المغيرة بن شعبة شغل الناس ا[ل]غمر عن |
| 3 | الصلاة حتى استقروا ثم صلا بالناس عبد الرحمن بن عوف فقرا انا اعطيناك الكوثر |
| 4 | واذا جاء نصر الله ثم خرج اذن (ابن) عمر فناد يا اهل المدينة يا اهل الشام يا اهل البصرة |
| 5 | يا اهل الكوفة ثم ادخلهم وكان اهل الكوفة اخر من دعي فما سألته احد |
| 6 | الوصيه غيرهم فقالوا (ا) له اوصى يا اسير المؤمنين فقال ان حدث على حدث فالامر الى |
| 7 | هؤلاء الستة نفر الذين توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو عنهم راض |
| 8 | قال ابن اسحاق عن ابي اسحاق السبيعي عن عمرو بن ميمون الاودي قال شهدت يوم طعن عمر |
| 9 | فقال عمر ادعوا (ا) لي عليا وعثمان وطلحة وسعد والزبير وعبد الرحمن فلما دخلوا |
| 10 | عليه لم يكلم منهم غير علي وعثمان فقال يعلى لعل هؤلاء القوم يعرفون لك قرابتك |
| 11 | بالنبي عليه السلام وعلمك وما اتاك الله من الفقه فان وليت بعدى الامر فاتقي ا |

- 12 لله ثم قال لعثمان يعثمان لعل هؤلاء القوم يعرفون لك صهرك برسول الله وسنك
 13 وشرفك فان وليت هذا الامر فاتقي الله ولا تجعلن بنى ابي معيط على رقاب الناس
 14 ثم قال ادعو(ا) لي صهييا فقال يصهييب صلى بالناس ثلثا وادخلوا هؤلاء نفر بيتا فان ا
 15 جتمع رايهم على رجل منهم فمن خالفهم فاضربوا عنقه واياكم والهوننا فانها تقطع
 16 المتصل وتهرى الشفقة ○ قال بن اسحاق فلما امر عمر بالشورا تطاول
 17 عمر بن العاص فانظره عمر فقال اطمئن كما وضعك الله فوالله لا اجعل

VERSO

- 1 فيها احدا] حمل السلاح على النبي عليه السلام ولولا ما طمعت بمعاوية ما طمع فيها
 2 طليق فل[يعلم]م الطليق ان هذا الامر لا يصلح للطلاق ولا لابنا الطلقاء ولا لمهاجرة الفتح
 3 فان اختلفتم فلا تطمعوا فيها الطلقاء ولا تظنوا ان عبد الله بن ابي ربيعة عنكم غا
 4 فلا ○ قال ابن اسحاق فلما دخل الشورى يشاورون قال لهم عبد الله بن ابي ربيعة بن
 5 المغيرة ادخلوني معكم قالوا لا ولا حبا ولا كرامة قال تسمعوا مني قالوا فاما شئت
 6 قال ان بايعتم عليا سمعنا وعصينا وان بايعتم عثمان سمعنا واطعنا ○
 7 قال بن اسحاق قال لهم المقداد بن الاسود لا تبايعوا لمن لم يشهد بيعة الرضوان و
 8 لم يشهد يوم الفرقان وفر يوم التقا الجمعان يريد عثمان فقال عثمان اما قوله
 9 لم يشهد بيعة الرضوان فان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ارسلني الى اهل مكة
 10 وكانت البيعة بعدى فبايع لي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بشماله وسما
 11 رسول الله خير يجيني ○ واما قوله لم يشهد يوم الفرقان فان رسول الله صلى الله
 12 عليه وسلم جعلني على بنته وكانت ساكتة وضرب لي سهمي واعطاني اجري ○
 13 واما قوله فر يوم التقا الجمعان فقد عفا الله عني فيما يوشى ○
 14 قال بن اسحاق واقبل المغيرة بن شعبة وعمرو بن العاص فجلسا عند باب اصحاب الشورا
 15 فمر بهم سعد بن ابي وقاص فقال اتريدان ان يراكما احد فيظن انكما من اهل اصحاب
 16 الشورا قوما فاقاسهما فمكث اصحاب الشورى يومين لا يقضون شى فقال لهم عبد الرحمن
 17 ابن عوف ما عليكم اكلكم يرجو الخلافة هل لكم تولونيها واخرج منها نفسى وابن عمى

TRANSLATION

RECTO

- 1 In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate,
 2 Muḥammad ibn Ishāq said: When Abū Lu'lu'ah the slave of Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah stabbed
 'Umar, the overwhelming misfortune distracted the people from
 3 prayer until they quieted down. Then 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf led the people in prayer. He
 read, "Verily, We have given you abundance"
 4 and "When comes the help of God." Then (Ibn) 'Umar went and called out, "(Come,) ye people
 of Medina, ye people of Syria, ye people of Baṣrah, and

- 5 ye people of Kūfah," and he caused them to enter ('Umar's presence). The people of Kūfah
 were the last to be called, and no one asked him ('Umar)
 6 to give his (last) instructions excepting them. They said to him, "Give instructions, O Com-
 mander of the Faithful." He said, "Should anything befall me, the affair is for
 7 these six persons, with whom, at the time of his death, the Messenger of God—may God bless
 him and give him peace—was well pleased."
 8 Ibn Ishāq reported on the authority of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'i on the authority of 'Amr ibn Maimūn
 al-Awdī, who said: I was present the day 'Umar was stabbed.
 9 'Umar said, "Bring me 'Alī and 'Uthmān and Ṭalḥah and Sa'd and al-Zubair and 'Abd al-Raḥmān."
 When they came in
 10 to him, he spoke to none of them except 'Alī and 'Uthmān. He said, "O 'Alī, it may be that these
 people will recognize your family relationship
 11 to the Prophet—peace be upon him—and your knowledge and what God has granted you of
 understanding. Should you be in command of affairs after me, then fear
 12 God." Next he said to 'Uthmān, "O 'Uthmān, it may be that these people will honor your
 relationship by marriage to the Messenger of God and (honor) your (advanced) age
 13 and your nobility. Should you be in command, then fear God and do not inflict the Banū Abī
 Mu'aiṭ (the Umayyads) on the people."
 14 Then he said, "Call Ṣuḥaib to me." And he said (to him), "O Ṣuḥaib, lead the people in prayer for
 three (days during which) let these persons (named) retire to a house (for consultation). And when
 15 they have agreed on one of themselves, strike off the head of anyone who opposes them. Beware
 of overmildness, for it severs
 16 bonds and exhausts solicitude." Ibn Ishāq said: When 'Umar commanded the formation of the
 elective council,
 17 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ intruded himself. 'Umar looked at him and said, "Be humble even as God
 Himself has humbled you; for, by God, I will not place

VERSO

- 1 in it (the caliphate) anyone who bore arms against the Prophet—peace be upon him. And had
 you not coveted it for Mu'āwiyah it would not have been coveted by
 2 anyone who was set free (after the Victory of Mecca). Let the freed one (Mu'āwiyah) know that
 this affair is not fitting for those thus freed nor for the sons of those thus freed nor for those
 who migrated after the Victory."
 3 (To the rest he said,) "Even should you disagree (among yourselves) do not encourage those
 (thus) set free to covet it. And think not that 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī'ah ibn al-Mughīrah is
 of what you do heed-
 4 less." Ibn Ishāq said: When the elective councilors entered (the house) to take council, 'Abd
 Allāh ibn Abī Rabī'ah ibn al-Mughīrah said to them,
 5 "Take me in with you." They replied, "No, neither out of love nor out of respect (would we
 willingly include you amongst us)." He said, "You (must) listen to me." They asked, "What
 is it you wish (to say)?"
 6 He said, "Should you swear allegiance to 'Alī, we hear and resist; but should you give allegiance
 to 'Uthmān, we hear and obey."
 7 Ibn Ishāq said: Miqdād ibn al-Aswad said to them, "Do not swear allegiance to one who was
 not present at the Oath of al-Raḍwān (Hudaibiyah) and
 8 who did not witness the Day of al-Furqān (Battle of Badr) and who fled the Day of the Meeting of
 the Two Hosts (Battle of Uḥud)," meaning 'Uthmān. Then 'Uthmān said, "As for his saying
 9 'one who was not at the Oath of al-Raḍwān,' the Messenger of God—may God bless him and
 grant him peace—sent me to the people of Mecca,

- 10 and the oath took place after I had gone. So, the Messenger of God—may God bless him and give him peace—took the oath for me by grasping his (own) left hand, and (furthermore) the
- 11 Messenger of God specified a bounty to come to me. And as for his saying 'he did not witness the Day of al-Furqān,' the Messenger of God—may God bless
- 12 him and give him peace—placed me in charge of his daughter, who was dying, and he assigned me my share (of the booty) and gave me my pay.
- 13 And as for his saying 'he fled the Day of the Meeting of the Two Hosts,' God has already forgiven me that for which he (now) reproaches (me)."
- 14 Ibn Ishāq said: Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah and 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ came forward and sat at the door of the council house.
- 15 Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ approached them and said, "Do you two wish that someone will see you both and come to think that you are among the
- 16 councilors? Up (and away with you)!" Thus he caused them to arise (and move away from the door). The councilors remained two days without coming to any decision. Then 'Abd al-Raḥman ibn 'Awf said to them,
- 17 "What is the matter with you? Does every one of you aspire to the caliphate? Would you (rather) leave the decision up to me provided I exclude myself and my paternal cousin (from the nomination)?"

Comments.—The assassination of the Caliph 'Umar and the appointment of the elective council are live subjects in Islāmic history. Caetani V 40–110 gives as exhaustive a treatment of these themes as the materials then available permitted. The most significant early source missing from his references is Balādhuri's *Ansāb*, but a number of supplementary sources from the fourth century on have become available since Caetani's time. These will be cited where they confirm the papyrus text or throw new light on the themes on hand.

Recto 1–4. Note that despite the beginning of a new section and the presence of the full name of the author, the latter's *isnād* or authority is not given. However, as all the significant parallels for these lines, with or without slight variation and scattered in more or less fuller accounts, trace back to 'Amr ibn Maimūn of recto 8 of the papyrus text, it is safe to assume that this Kūfan eyewitness source is Ibn Ishāq's ultimate authority for these lines (cf. Ibn Sa'd III 1, pp. 244, 246 f.; Bukhārī II 431 f.; Abū Nu'aim IV 151; Ibn al-Jauzī, *Ta'rikh 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb* [Cairo, 1924] p. 215). Ṭabarī I 2722 f. is very brief, does not draw on 'Amr, and is least similar to the papyrus text. The story of the Persian Abū Lu'lu'ah (line 2) is fully related in the sources. He is variously described as a Christian (Ibn Sa'd III 1, p. 258; Ṭabarī I 2722, 2797; Maqdisī V 188 f.), a Magian (Mas'ūdī IV 226; Ibn al-Jauzī *op. cit.* pp. 212, 221), and a Sabian (Caetani V 205 f., n. 1). He was, in all probability, a Muslim convert at the time of the murder (Caetani V 41, 51 f.). For lines 3–4 most of the sources report the reading of these two short sūrahs, Nos. 108 and 110, though other short sūrahs are sometimes substituted (cf. Ibn Sa'd III 1, p. 246:18; Maqdisī V 189) in an effort, later no doubt, to establish the idea that the two sūrahs read are actually the shortest ones in the Qur'ān.

Recto 4–6. The only parallel so far discovered traces back through the famous Shu'bah ibn Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777) to Juwairiyah ibn Qudāmah, an 'Irāqī participant in the affair, who reports it in the first person (see Ibn Sa'd, III 1, p. 243:15–23).

The severely wounded 'Umar is obviously not the one who went out to call the various groups, and the parallel passage does not state who it was that actually did so. However, since 'Umar's son 'Abd Allāh was on hand, it was probably he who called the people to his father's presence. The omission of "ibn" from the text is no doubt a scribal error, such as occurs in recto 14 and verso 3, but one that, unlike the latter, went unnoticed by the text collator. Other scribal errors, corrected as they occurred, appear in recto 5 and 6. For the use of the form $\dot{\text{و}}\dot{\text{ل}}\dot{\text{ا}}$ instead of $\dot{\text{و}}\dot{\text{ل}}\dot{\text{ا}}$, cf. Lane, p. 41.

Recto 6–7. This text, with little or no variation, is frequently quoted on the authority of ‘Amr ibn Maimūn (see Ibn Sa’d III 1, pp. 245, 246, 248; Ya’qūbī II 184; Maqdisī V 189; Bukhārī I 351, II 443; Ibn al-Jauzī, *op. cit.* pp. 209, 214). The report, with some marked variation in terminology, is supported by other *isnād*’s (cf. e.g. Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad*, p. 11; Ibn Ḥanbal I 48 f.; Ibn Sa’d III 1, pp. 243, 249; *Ansāb* V 15 f.; Ṭabarī I 2723 f.). The six men are named in *recto* 9. They were the survivors of the elite ten that originally formed the group to whom Muḥammad promised Paradise (cf. Ibn Sa’d III 1, p. 279).

Ibn Ishāq has drawn on two separate sources to give the composite account of lines 4–7.

Recto 8–15. This passage with its *isnād* is found in Ibn Sa’d III 1, p. 247: 12–19, and *Ansāb* V 16: 6–16. Collation of these texts shows very close parallelism to the sequence and essential meaning of the papyrus text despite some grammatical variations and the use of synonyms particularly in the *Ansāb* text. Some of these variants are no doubt due to copying from texts written in an unpointed cursive script: e.g. *انا لك* for *اتاك* and *تجعلن* for *تجعلن* of the papyrus text.

‘Amr ibn Maimūn’s lengthy account of the assassination of ‘Umar and the formation of the council is the common source of all three authors, as it is also the source for later works (e.g. Ṭabarī I 2776; Abū Nu’aim IV 151 f.; Ibn al-Jauzī, *op. cit.* p. 224). It is noteworthy that though Ibn Ishāq acknowledges his debt to ‘Amr and the latter’s transmitter Abū Ishāq al-Sabī’ī at this one point, he is, in reality, indebted to them for much more of the papyrus text, as will be seen presently. It is to be noted further that even when similar and/or supplementary accounts are available (in this instance Ibn Sa’d III 1, p. 249: 6–11 and pp. 249: 16–250: 1, the latter passage on the authority of Ibn Ishāq’s famous teacher Zuhri) it is still ‘Amr’s text that Ibn Ishāq uses here and elsewhere. For this Kūfan ‘Amr ibn Maimūn (d. 74/693) see *Ma’ārif*, p. 217; Abū Nu’aim IV 148–54; Dhahabī I 61; Nawawī, p. 483; *Iṣābah* III 232 f. For Abū Ishāq al-Sabī’ī (d. 127 or 128/744 or 745 at age of over 95) see *Ma’ārif*, p. 230; Ṭabarī III 2502; Dhahabī I 107 f.; Nawawī, pp. 645 f.

The papyrus text has some bearing on several controversial points. It, along with others, confirms the inclusion of Sa’d in the elective council in contrast to some authorities, including Zuhri and Wāqidi, who deny it (cf. *Ansāb* V 21 and see below, Comments on verso 16–17). Again, it shows ‘Umar addressing ‘Alī ahead of ‘Uthmān, whereas others reverse the order; cf. Ibn Sa’d III 1, p. 247: 23, which, curiously enough, traces back to ‘Amr ibn Maimūn and thus involves him in a contradictory statement! Finally, our text passes over in silence a statement, traced back to Zuhri, that ‘Umar addressed himself first to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, ahead of the other two (cf. Ibn Sa’d III 1, pp. 249 f.).

In contrast to these controversial points, Ṣuḥaib’s leadership in prayer, despite a speech defect, is not contested. His full name is Ṣuḥaib ibn Sinān. He was strongly attached to ‘Umar and was in brotherhood bond with Sa’d (cf. Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-bayān wa-al-tabyīn* [Cairo, 1947] I 87; Ibn Sa’d III 1, pp. 246 f., 267 f.; Ṭabarī I 2724–26, 2778 f.; *Tanbih*, pp. 290 f.). For the story of Ṣuḥaib and Muḥammad and for the former’s *musnad*, see Ibn Ḥanbal VI 15 and IV 332 respectively; for biographical notices see Ibn Sa’d III 2, pp. 161–64; Abū Nu’aim I 151–56; Ibn ‘Asākir VI 446–54; *Iṣābah* II 413–17.

Recto 15–16. It is possible to read *سفته* in line 16 and translate “rends covenants” instead of “exhausts solicitude.” No parallels have turned up for these lines. However, a related thought is found in Ibn Sa’d III 1, p. 250: 3–4, on the authority of Abū Ma’shar (d. 170/786 or 787): *قال عمر هذا الامر لا يصاح الا بالشدة التي لا جبريه فيها وباللين الذي لا وهن فيه*, “This affair (of the caliphate) cannot be rightly administered except through strength without compulsion and mildness without weakness.” Both statements are thoroughly in keeping with ‘Umar’s stern yet basically just character.

Recto 16–*verso* 4. No parallel to the passage as a whole is available in the sources on hand. It is obviously a composite report put together by Ibn Ishāq. Some of its materials can be traced, as will be shown presently, to their original sources.

Recto 16-verso 1. Ansāb V 17:17-19 gives a very close parallel on the authority of Wāqidi through an *isnād* that traces back again to 'Amr ibn Maimūn. There are three different versions of the conversion of 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ: early and secret conversion during an anti-Islāmic mission to the Negus of Abyssinia; conversion in the year seven and therefore post-Ḥudaibiyah; conversion in the year eight but prior to the conquest of Mecca. The second of these versions is the most generally accepted (cf. *Sīrah*, pp. 217, 716; Ibn S'ad VII 2, p. 188; Ṭabarī I 1189; Nawawī, pp. 478 f.; *Iṣābah* III 1 f.).

Verso 1-2. So far no direct *early* parallel text has come to light in support of this teamwork between 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ and Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān in reference to the latter's aspirations to the caliphate at this early date. But confirmation of 'Umar's concern about Mu'āwiyah's ambitions as well as about those of 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī'ah are reflected in *Iṣābah* II 745 in a passage that gives no indication of its earlier sources. Mu'āwiyah's caliphal ambitions, according to Mu'āwiyah himself, are said to date back to a conversation between him and Muḥammad, whom he quotes as saying, "Should you be in command, fear God and render justice," using, it should be noted, some of the very terms that 'Umar used in addressing 'Alī and 'Uthmān! Cf. *Iqd* II 299; Nawawī, p. 565; *Iṣābah* III 887.

Verso 3-4. The only parallel to this passage—a close one at that, though no source is specified—is found in *Iṣābah* II 745 under the biographical notice of the above-named 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī'ah, a powerful Makhzūmite, who was placated by Muḥammad, converted after the Victory of Mecca, appointed governor of the Yemen by 'Umar, and later appointed governor of the Najd by 'Uthmān (see *Sīrah*, p. 217; Ibn Sa'd V 328; Ṭabarī I 1189, 2798, 3057, III 2386).

For the application of the term *ṭaliq* to all Meccans who were set free after the conquest of their city and the subsequent limiting of the term to the Quraish, see Lane, art. "Ṭalaq," p. 1874. For an early categorical statement that no *ṭaliq* was fit for the caliphate, see Ibn Sa'd III 1, p. 248:10-11, where the statement is traced back through 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abzī to 'Umar himself, as in the papyrus text. The statement is reflected also in *Iṣābah* II 745. The papyrus text is in part quite close to both sources. For this 'Abd al-Raḥmān, who served under 'Umar but settled later in Kūfah, there transmitting traditions to noted Kūfans, see Ibn Sa'd V 341; Nawawī, pp. 375 f.; and particularly *Iṣābah* II 936 f. For the application of the term *al-ṭaliq ibn al-ṭaliq* to Mu'āwiyah himself see *Iqd* II 271; Lammens, "Études sur le règne du calife omayyade Mo'awia I^{er}," Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth, *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale* II (Leipzig, 1907) 167. Mu'āwiyah was frequently taunted by 'Alī, and by others later when he aimed at the caliphate in 'Alī's reign, with the facts that he had not been converted and had not migrated until after the Victory of Mecca (see Ya'qūbī II 217; Mas'ūdī V 100 f.; Ibn 'Asākir VII 107). In an effort to overcome this handicap Mu'āwiyah, like his team-mate 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, claimed an earlier and secret conversion, a claim which seems to have convinced no one (see *Sīrah*, pp. 755, 881; Nawawī, p. 564).

Priority according to the order of conversion and migration, ending with the Victory of Mecca, was known in Muḥammad's time, but it took the stern 'Umar to stabilize and enforce it as a fundamental national policy of early Islām. The Companions were classified in twelve grades on this basis (see Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, *Kitāb ma'rifat 'ulūm al-ḥadīth* [Cairo, 1937] pp. 22-24, 41; Sūrah 9:100 and standard Qur'ānic commentaries). For a fuller discussion of the Qur'ānic position and its historical appreciation see Ṭaḥawī, *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥawiyah*, pp. 396-98; Bukhārī II 198, 267 f., III 146; see also Aren Jan Wensinck, *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition* (Leiden, 1927) "Hijrah"; Lammens in *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale* II 62-64; Goldziher, *Studien* II 122 f.

Verso 4-6. No parallel is available for the passage in its entirety, nor is there any other reference to 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī'ah's direct request for inclusion in the council. On the other hand, there are more detailed accounts of his stand for 'Uthmān and the dispute between 'Abd Allāh and the partisans of 'Alī, including Miqdād of verso 7. These accounts have much in common, and the text of Ṭabarī I 2785 points to 'Amr ibn Maimūn as its source, a fact which is definitely confirmed by Ibn al-Athīr III 54 f. See also *Ansāb* V 19, quoting Wāqidi and Ibn Sa'd; Maqdisī V 191; *Iqd* II 260; *Iṣābah* II 745.

Verso 7-13. The direct attack of Miqdād on 'Uthmān and the latter's speech in defense of himself are nowhere reported in this setting, though the substance of the passage is frequently met with in the sources in various other settings and versions, which will be discussed below. It may be suggested here that the passage in all probability traces back to the lost work on the Umayyad dynasty by the Kūfan 'Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 147 or 158/764 or 775) entitled *Kitāb sirat Mu'āwiyah wa-Banī Umayyah* (cf. *Fihrist*, p. 91). The Makhzūmite Miqdād (d. 33/653, with 'Uthmān conducting the funeral prayer) was one of the earliest converts to Islām, a master archer, who fought in all of Muḥammad's campaigns, and an 'Alid sympathizer (see Wellhausen, Index; Ibn Sa'd III 1, pp. 114-16; Ṭabarī III 2312 f.; Abū Nu'aim I 172-76; Nawawī, pp. 575 f.; *Iṣābah* III 931-33; also Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad*, pp. 158 f.).

Verso 8-11. For 'Uthmān's well known role in the negotiations at Ḥudaibīyah between Muḥammad and the Meccans, see *Sirah*, p. 746; Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 69-76; Ṭabarī I 1542 f.; *Iṣābah* II 1103 f.; Nawawī, p. 412. For the distribution of properties to those who took the Oath of al-Raḍwān, called also the "Pact of the Tree" because sworn to under a tree, see *Sirah*, p. 780; Wellhausen, p. 287; Ibn Sa'd IV 2, pp. 8, 39, 54, VI, p. 4, VII 2, p. 190; Ṭabarī I 1589.

Verso 11-12. سأكته may also be read for its synonym ساكنه (cf. Lane, pp. 1307, 1394). 'Uthmān had married Muḥammad's daughter, Ruqqīyah. She was on the verge of death when the expedition left for Badr and died before the battle was over. 'Uthmān was left in charge of her, and Muḥammad did not forget his generous supporter and son-in-law when it came to according prestige and dividing the spoils (cf. *Sirah*, pp. 457, 486; Wāqidī, pp. 97, 153 [= Wellhausen, pp. 66, 83]; Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 6, III 1, p. 38, VIII, p. 24; Bukhārī II 431; Ṭabarī I 1358; Nawawī, p. 409; *Iṣābah* II 1104).

Verso 12-13. The Battle of Uḥud was a signal defeat for Muḥammad and his followers, most of whom were eventually put to flight by the Meccans. 'Uthmān is found wanting particularly because he had not on that occasion stood his ground along with *all the rest of his now fellow councilors* (cf. Wāqidī, pp. 237, 272 [= Wellhausen, pp. 115, 130]; Ṭabarī I 1411 f.). The defeat was turned into a religious and moral victory, and Muḥammad assured his followers that God Himself had forgiven the fugitives, 'Uthmān, of course, included (cf. Sūrah 3:155, 166; Bell I 60, 66; Bukhārī III 83).

Verso 14-16. This episode, with some variations, is reported in Ṭabarī I 2776 and 2781 f. in a composite account that includes among its *isnād*'s one that traces back to Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'i and 'Amr ibn Maimūn. Ibn al-Athīr III 53 repeats Ṭabarī's text in an account which is definitely that of 'Amr ibn Maimūn, thus helping to pin down the latter as not only Ṭabarī's but also Ibn Ishāq's specific source for these materials. The Ṭabarī version of the text is repeated also in *Iqd* II 258, and an obvious abridgment of it is found in Ibn Miskawaih, *Tajārib al-umam* ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series" VII) I 463 f. The papyrus text differs from all these in one detail. It does not contain the word فخصبهما. That is, it says nothing about Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ pelting 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ and Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah with pebbles in an effort to drive these worthies away from the gate of the council house. For Caetani's reaction to this episode and its implication for the fixed membership of the council, see Caetani V 82 and 87, n. 10.

Verso 16-17. A fuller version of this passage is reported in *Ansāb* V 20:22-21:1, 21:10 f., and 21:14 f., from the account of the Kūfan Abū Mikhnaḥ, a younger contemporary of 'Amr ibn Maimūn. Related passages tracing back to 'Amr himself are also available, but the papyrus text is not so close to them as to the *Ansāb* passage; cf. Ibn Sa'd III 1, p. 245:21; Ṭabarī I 2780; Ibn al-Athīr III 53; *Tanbih*, p. 291; Ibn Miskawaih, *Tajārib al-umam* I 462; Abū Nu'aim I 98. In all these 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf offers to exclude himself alone from the caliphate in contrast to Abū Mikhnaḥ's version, followed by Ibn Ishāq, where he offers to exclude both himself and his cousin Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ.

Abū Mikhnaḥ was an avowed 'Alid, who left among his thirty-two monographs a work entitled *Al-shūrā wa-maqtal 'Uthmān* (sic! = 'Umar?) or *The Elective Council and the Assassination of 'Uthmān* (cf. *Fihrist*, p. 93). This work has not survived, but it was most probably the direct source of Ibn Ishāq's abridged text. Ibn Ishāq, as the papyrus illustrates, drew freely on Shī'ite authors and

traditionists when their materials suited his purpose. This may have been one of the reasons that led some to accuse him of Shī'ite partisanship (cf. *Irshād* VI 400).

DATE, PROVENANCE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

Before the papyrus fragment can be assigned an approximate date, it is necessary to orient the work it represents, the *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* or *History of the Caliphs*, in the author's professional career.

Ibn Ishāq, like many of his generation, started out as a traditionist. He collected a vast number of legal and historical traditions and transmitted them to his pupils while he was still in Medina.¹ His initial historical interest, like that of his outstanding teachers and fellow pupils, centered in the *maghāzī* or campaigns of Muḥammad. For early Islāmic military history in general and the campaigns of Muḥammad in particular became an object of historical research with the generation following Muḥammad, gathered momentum in the next, and reached a climax in the expert *maghāzī* works of two of Ibn Ishāq's most prominent teachers—Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741) and 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr (d. 130 or 135/747 or 752). Following in the footsteps of these masters Ibn Ishāq and his fellow pupils Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah and Ma'mar ibn Rāshid, as stated above (p. 75), each composed an expert work on the *maghāzī*, transmitting much of their teachers' material. There is some evidence that these works were not limited to the campaigns proper but treated, presumably in an introductory fashion, the earlier life of Muḥammad. This, it is believed, gave rise to a rather loose interchangeability of the terms *sīrah* and *maghāzī*.

Simultaneously with the above-mentioned development, though to a lesser degree, interest was displayed in origins, in world history, and particularly in the history or rather the stories of the prophets. The first "expert" work in this field was, as stated elsewhere, Wahb ibn Munabbih's *Kitāb al-mubtadā'*.² Ibn Ishāq was the first to conceive the idea of integrating these several themes into a sort of universal history that centered more or less around a history of prophecy, culminating in the prophetic mission of Muḥammad. The *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'*, of which little except the title has heretofore been known, was presumed to have been a brief history of the caliphate in continuation of the universal history, covering the period from the time of Muḥammad to the author's own day.

Extensive studies³ of the life and works of Ibn Ishāq have shown that the materials for both his *Sīrah* proper, with its subdivisions of the *Mab'ath* and the *Maghāzī*, and his *Mubtadā'* trace back to Medinan and a few Egyptian authorities to the all but complete exclusion of the 'Irāqī sources.⁴ On the other hand, all but one of Ibn Ishāq's eighteen listed pupils, who are known to have transmitted part or all of these historical materials, are from the eastern provinces of 'Irāq and Persia.⁵ Based on these facts, several plausible assumptions have been advanced relative to the time of origin and the progress of Ibn Ishāq's main work; first, that Ibn Ishāq, while still in Medina, had evolved a comprehensive plan for a single integrated work to end with the complete life of Muḥammad; second, that the work in all its parts was practically completed before the author left Medina for 'Irāq; and, third, that each of the loosely interchangeable terms *maghāzī* and *sīrah* was extendible to include *mubtadā'*. Facts that have come to the fore in the course of the present study throw some doubts on the second and third of these assumptions and suggest alternative, if perforce tentative, conclusions.

The first striking peculiarity about the above-mentioned three title terms is the great difference in the frequency of their occurrence, *maghāzī* being by far the most frequent, *sīrah* the second, and

¹ Khaṭīb I 220, 277 f.

² Cf. the writer's "An Arabic papyrus in the Oriental Institute," *JNES* V 170 f.

³ Johann Fück, *Muḥammad ibn Ishāq*, pp. 34-43; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 172.

⁴ See August Fischer, *Biographien von Gewährsmännern des Ibn Ishāq*.

⁵ Fück, *op. cit.* p. 44, lists only 15 of these; see below (p. 92) for the others. See also Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 176 f.

mubtadā' a poor third. The second peculiarity noted is the confusion in the logical and chronological order when two or all three terms are used in what is generally assumed to be the title of a single book. The combinations met with are *al-maghāzī wa-al-mubtadā'*,¹ *al-mubtadā'* (= *mabdā'*) *wa-al-maghāzī*,² *al-siyar wa-al-maghāzī*,³ *al-maghāzī wa-al-siyar*,⁴ *al-sīrah wa-al-mubtadā'* *wa-al-maghāzī*,⁵ and *al-maghāzī wa-al-siyar wa-akhbār al-mubtadā'*.⁶ It is to be noticed that even in the compound titles the term *maghāzī* predominates and that in half of the titles in which it occurs it is the leading word. A third peculiarity in connection with these terms and titles is the wide disagreement of the literary sources on the *number* of books that are credited to Ibn Ishāq on these subjects. Nadīm has one book only, *Kitāb al-sīrah wa-al-mubtadā'* *wa-al-maghāzī*. Yāqūt breaks this into two, *Kitāb al-siyar wa-al-maghāzī* and *Kitāb al-mabdā'*.⁷ Mas'ūdī's use of the plural *kutub*, "books," and his listing of the titles indicate not one book but three books: (*Kitāb*) *al-maghāzī*, (*Kitāb*) *al-siyar*, and (*Kitāb*) *akhbār al-mubtadā'*.

When the above-stated facts are considered together they suggest to the present writer not a one-volume work of three parts delivered orally and simultaneously as a unit but a three-volume set "published" in two or possibly three separate stages. Mas'ūdī, in his use of the plural *kutub*, in the order of his titles indicating coverage of the complete life of Muḥammad, the lives of the prophets, and the story of creation, and finally in seeing in this triple coverage something new in Islāmic historiography, does actually convey the thought of a multivolumed work, though his statement is somewhat lacking in stylistic clarity. The full passage, which quite significantly occurs in a list of the glorious achievements during the reign of the Caliph Maṣṣūr (136-58/754-75), reads: "In his (Maṣṣūr's) time Muḥammad ibn Ishāq composed the books of *al-maghāzī* and *al-siyar* and *akhbār al-mubtadā'*. Before then these (books or subjects) had not been brought together or comprehended or organized." Mas'ūdī, the expert professional historian of his day, had every reason to know that each of these subjects had received professional treatment at the hands of at least one "expert" before Ibn Ishāq's and Maṣṣūr's time. If we supply "books" instead of "subjects" and interpret the passage to mean that no books were *written down* on these subjects prior to Ibn Ishāq's work, that interpretation too will not stand the test of controlling historical facts not all of which could possibly have escaped Mas'ūdī's own attention. For not only is Ibn Ishāq himself accused of using written works as direct source materials, but his teacher Zūhrī and at least two of his fellow pupils *wrote books* on the *maghāzī*, while even earlier Wahb and others had produced books on the *siyar* and the *mubtadā'*, as Mas'ūdī himself well knew.⁸ Mas'ūdī, himself writing and thinking in terms of universal history, was in a better position than most of the others to appreciate and evaluate Ibn Ishāq's original contribution as being primarily one of scope and integration.

In the light of the foregoing remarks it is possible to draw several tentative and interrelated conclusions: (1) Ibn Ishāq's major work was given to the world in at least two stages. (2) He first rose to fame as *ṣāhib al-maghāzī*, even as his teachers and fellow pupils did. (3) The *Maghāzī* proper was the first part of the work and probably the only part to be in complete or nearly complete form when he fled Medina in 132/749. (4) The earliest references to Ibn Ishāq's reading aloud, dictating, or writing down the *Maghāzī* in Medina or 'Irāq cover primarily the campaigns of Muḥammad and not the full and complete events of his life. (5) Frequent and continued interchangeability of the title *Maghāzī* with the title *Sīrah* came later and was due as much to the inclusion of the part in the whole and the tendency to indicate a whole by a part as to the popularity of Ibn Hishām's unevenly abridged version

¹ Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 110.

² Maqdisī II 84; *Irshād* VI 430.

³ *Irshād* VI 401.

⁴ Mas'ūdī IV 116.

⁵ *Fihrist*, p. 92.

⁶ Mas'ūdī VIII 291.

⁷ Both *GAL* I 135 and *S* I 205 f. list these as two separate works and indicate Ḥalabī's knowledge of the

Mubtadā', which was known to the earlier Maqdisī and Māwardī also.

⁸ Cf. Maqdisī I 150, 158, 205, where the author refers to materials found in Wahb's book, *fī kitāb Wahb*, which, considering the subject matter, must be Wahb's *Mubtadā'*. See also Mas'ūdī I 10, 127, III 320, V 462-64; *Fihrist*, p. 94; Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* I 535-60.

of the entire set under the title *Sirah*.¹ (6) It is for these reasons that Ibn Ishāq is known primarily as *ṣāhib al-maghāzī* and *ṣāhib al-sirah* and oddly enough as *ṣāhib al-sirah wa-al-maghāzī*, but rarely as *ṣāhib al-mubtadā' wa-al-maghāzī*.²

Further evidence in support of the probability that no part of the work was actually in final written form before Ibn Ishāq left Medina is seen in the fact that only one Medinan student, Ibrāhīm ibn Sa'd (110-84/728-800),³ is mentioned as having *heard* the *Maghāzī* from him. The argument would hold equally if we assume that Ibrāhīm *heard* all of the work from his master and even took down notes, since a single student's notes from one recitation only did not constitute publication. The first evidence of the *Maghāzī* being *heard* after Ibn Ishāq's departure from Medina is his public recitation of his materials, quite possibly with the aid of a preliminary manuscript, in the province of Jazīrah in 142/760 under the patronage of the 'Abbāsīd Governor 'Abbās ibn Muḥammad. Soon thereafter Ibn Ishāq joined the Caliph Maṣṣūr at Hīrah. The exact year is not known, though it must have been before 146/763, at which date Maṣṣūr moved his court to his new capital city of Baghdād. It is in connection with this very period of Maṣṣūr's patronage at Hīrah that Ibn Ishāq is first mentioned as *writing down* the *Maghāzī*, for Maṣṣūr *fa kataba lahu al-maghāzī*, that is, sometime between 142/760 and 146/763. It was also at this time that Ibn Ishāq first dictated the *Maghāzī* to one of its most trusted transmitters, Ziyād ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'i.⁴ All of these facts point to the plausible conclusion that Ibn Ishāq spent the years after his arrival in 'Irāq in 132/749 in organizing his materials and preparing the final draft of his manuscript, completing the section on the *maghāzī* first.

In the light of the possibilities suggested above, it becomes necessary to re-examine a passage, preserved only by Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (392-464/1002-71), that has been suspected of being legendary.⁵ Briefly, the gist of the passage is that Maṣṣūr on introducing his son Maḥdī to Ibn Ishāq commissioned the latter to compose a universal history from Adam to the author's own day for the benefit of the prince. When the work was completed the caliph found it too lengthy for the prince's needs. Maṣṣūr therefore asked Ibn Ishāq to abridge it for the prince, but kept the original for his own library.⁶ The passage has been interpreted so far to mean that it was Maṣṣūr who provided the original inspiration for the plan and scope of Ibn Ishāq's work. As such it deserves to be suspect. Actually, however, the passage need not be so interpreted, for it does not take too much imagination to reinterpret it in the light of the interplay of several sets of facts and conditions bearing on the present discussion.

When Ibn Ishāq first appeared at Maṣṣūr's court, Prince Maḥdī, the heir (b. 126 or 127/744 or 745), was still a youth in his teens. The serious-minded and thrifty Maṣṣūr held simple court with no display whatsoever, not even for royalty. There is, therefore, nothing strange about the simple meeting of scholar and prince at the court. Maṣṣūr, who supervised Maḥdī's liberal education and political training, ordered him to study the *Maghāzī* with Ibn Ishāq.⁷ It is significant to note that it was at about this time, too, that Maṣṣūr commissioned the poet Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbī (d. 170/786) to select a collection of poems for the instruction of the crown prince, which collection became famous as *Al-Mufaḍḍaliyāt*.⁸ Again, it is entirely possible that Ibn Ishāq in the course of writing down his *Maghāzī* for the caliph revealed his ambitious plan for a work to reach as far back as the creation. Under such circumstances, what is known of Maṣṣūr's thoroughness, his keen judgment of character, including that of Maḥdī, and his far-visioned cultural interests not only lends credence to Khaṭīb's

¹ All of the literary references to these titles are much later than Ibn Hishām's time, the 4th-century *Fihrist* being the earliest.

² See Khaṭīb I 214-16; Maqdisī I 149, II 84; *Irshād* VI 400; also references in nn. 1-6 on p. 88 above.

³ Cf. *Fihrist*, p. 92; Khaṭīb VI 81-86; Yāqūt VI 401.

⁴ Cf. *Ma'ārif*, p. 247; *Irshād* VI 399; Khaṭīb VIII 477; see also p. 94 below.

⁵ Fück, *op. cit.* p. 34, n. 49; *GAL* S I 205; Horowitz in *Islamic Culture* II 172.

⁶ Khaṭīb I 221. The *isnād* goes no further than the first half of the 4th century, and its authorities are all men from 'Irāq and farther east: Abū 'Alī Hāmid al-Harawī (d. 356/967), Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad (301-93/912-1003), and 'Ammār ibn Muḥammad ibn Mukhlad (d. 387/997), for whom cf. Khaṭīb XIII 173, VII 423 f., and XII 256 f. respectively.

⁷ Khaṭīb VII 345.

⁸ *Fihrist*, p. 68; *GAL* S I 36.

report but almost demands it. For, in the light of the discussion so far, the passage need mean no more than that the thorough Maṣṣūr commissioned the gifted scholar to *extend* his work to cover the time from Adam to the author's own day, that is, to *add* to it still another part, namely, the *Ta'riḫ al-khulafā'*. That Maṣṣūr, who knew his sociable and pleasure-loving son too well, should find the work, with or without the *Ta'riḫ*, too long for Maḥdī's needs and tastes is perfectly understandable. An abridgment for the prince's benefit becomes the next logical step, with the serious-minded Maṣṣūr retaining the full-length original for his own library. Such a work would find a well deserved place among the literary, historical, and scientific collections, compositions, and translations known to have been initiated and sponsored by this great caliph.

An abridgment is generally accomplished not at the expense of the core of a work—in the present case the full *Sirah*—but at that of introductory or/and supplementary materials—in this instance the *Mubtadā'* or the *Ta'riḫ*. That the *Mubtadā'* was quite lengthy to begin with is attested by the need Ibn Hishām felt to abridge it so drastically in his recension of the *Sirah*. That the *Ta'riḫ* was comparatively brief has been suspected, but largely on the grounds of its general obscurity.¹ If it was actually composed under the circumstances stated in or inferred from Khaṭīb's account, the *Ta'riḫ* had to be brief not only because the rest of the work was already voluminous but also because of the time that would be needed for a new collection of materials for the writing of an exhaustive history of the caliphs down to the author's time on the same scale as that of the *Sirah*. This conclusion would be equally reasonable whether the *Ta'riḫ* was composed at Maṣṣūr's suggestion or on the author's own initiative. Under either condition the work would have a character and an identity of its own.

It has taken a roundabout way to arrive at this orientation of the *Ta'riḫ al-khulafā'* in Ibn Ishāq's writing career as far as could be deduced from the literary sources. It is time to consider the evidence of the papyrus itself, be the literary facts as they may.

In contrast to Ibn Ishāq's Medinan and Egyptian authorities for his earlier work, those for the papyrus text are all 'Irāqī, with Kūfans to the fore. The main authority, 'Amr ibn Maimūn, his transmitter Abū Ishāq,² the famous monographer Abū Mikhnaḥ,³ the traditionist 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abzī,⁴ and the eyewitness Juwairiyah ibn Qudāmah⁵ are all Kūfans. Even in the few lines of the papyrus text, for which so far no close parallels have been discovered, the affinity of the text is for Kūfan sources.⁶ Exclusive reliance on Kūfan sources persists even for the themes which are covered by Ibn Ishāq's famous teacher Zuhri.⁷ Whether this feature is characteristic of the entire *Ta'riḫ* is difficult to say with certainty, though the indications point in that direction. A check on Ṭabarī's use of the *Ta'riḫ* revealed the following facts. Ibn Ishāq used for some of the events of the reign of Abū Bakr several of the Medinan authorities quoted in his *Sirah*.⁸ But his materials for succeeding reigns either give no indication of his sources⁹ or trace back to Kūfan authorities¹⁰—both practices illustrated in the papyrus text. Furthermore, all of Ibn Ishāq's transmitters of the *Ta'riḫ* materials were his Kūfan pupils¹¹ and contemporaries,¹² with Salamah ibn al-Faḍl as chief transmitter.¹³ All of these facts lead one, first, to suspect that Ibn Ishāq's materials bearing on the short reign of Abū Bakr were collected in Medina during the rounding-out of the *Sirah* and, second, to conclude not only that the *Ta'riḫ al-khulafā'* was actually composed in 'Irāq but that the bulk of its materials were first collected and brought together in the eastern provinces of the 'Abbāsīd Empire.

Again, in contrast to the lengthy treatment of the *Sirah*, particularly the *Maghāzī* section, the papyrus

¹ See Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 182; H. A. R. Gibb's art. "Ta'riḫ" in *EI* Supplement, p. 235.

² See above, Comments on recto 1-4, 6-7, 8-15, 16 to verso 1, 4-6, and 14-16.

³ See above, Comments on verso 16-17.

⁴ See above, Comments on verso 3-4.

⁵ See above, Comments on recto 4-6.

⁶ See above, e.g. Comments on verso 3-4 and 7-13.

⁷ See above, Comments on recto 8-15.

⁸ Ṭabarī I 1829, 1890, 1897, 1903, 1905-6, 1927, 1944, 2077, 2107, 2125, 2143.

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 2520, 2570, 2579-81, 2590, 2646, 2728, 2769.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 2144, 2757, 2772.

¹¹ *Ibid.* pp. 1799, 1800, 2757.

¹² *Ibid.* pp. 3327, 3356 and Vol. II 127 f.

¹³ See Ṭabarī, Index, under his name.

text proves to be, as repeatedly pointed out above in the "Comments," either a compact composite summary from several authors' accounts or a partial quotation from, or abridgment of, some single report. The papyrus folio, if we assume it to be typical of the whole, confirms, at least in reference to the *Ta'rikh*, Khaṭīb's report of a short or an abridged work. All in all, these considerations lend support, if indirect, to the argument, based so far on evidence external to the papyrus, that Maṣṣūr played a part in both the inception and the summary character of the *Ta'rikh*.

II

Because the Oriental Institute manuscript is of papyrus, it is necessary to explore first the possibility that the copy which it represents originated in one of the three western provinces: Syria, Ḥijāz, or Egypt. The literary evidence here is for the most part scant, indirect, and negative. Except for the 'Irāqī Ibn Hishām (d. 218/834), of *Sirah* fame,¹ no scholar who traveled to or from these regions is specifically associated with either Ibn Ishāq himself or his many pupils. Ibn Hishām may or may not have carried with him into Egypt a copy of the *Ta'rikh* along with the rest of Ibn Ishāq's works (see p. 98). What is certain is that no reference to the *Ta'rikh* by leading Egyptian historians is found. 'Abd al-Hakam (ca. 187–257/803–71) cites Ibn Hishām on the authority of Ibn Ishāq, but for *Sirah* materials only, while Kindī (283–350/897–961) does not cite him at all. Ibn Ishāq's one Medinan pupil, the above-mentioned Ibrāhīm ibn Sa'd (see p. 89), toward the end of his life settled with his family in 'Irāq,² where Abū Ja'far al-Warrāq (d. 228/843), famous copyist and stationer to the Barmakid wazīr Faḍl, is said to have transmitted the *Maghāzī* of Ibn Ishāq from him.³ In Medina itself suspicion of Ibn Ishāq's doctrine and method continued, and so the transmission of his materials was discouraged.⁴ The scholarly affiliation of both Egypt and Syria with the Ḥijāz may have contributed in part to the comparative disfavor and/or obscurity of Ibn Ishāq's works in these western provinces. Faced from the start with such disapproval, Ibn Ishāq's works, the *Ta'rikh* even more than the *Sirah*, would have tended to remain neglected and suspect in these provinces in the succeeding centuries. That this was actually the case is directly confirmed through Medina for the Ḥijāz—and perhaps also indirectly along with the absence of more evidence for the two other provinces—by the famous 'Irāqī scholar Muḥammad ibn 'Umrān al-Marzabānī (296–384/908–94).⁵

In the light of the above-stated evidence, the origin of the papyrus is to be placed preferably in one of the eastern provinces, 'Irāq or Persia, which were the decisive centers of Ibn Ishāq's activities and of the transmission of his works, particularly the *Ta'rikh*. Such attribution, in turn, would limit the dating to the time of one of two teacher-pupil groups: Ibn Ishāq himself and his pupils or the latter and their immediate transmitters. The date which divides the two groups is set by Ibn Ishāq's death in 152/769. And in as much as the last surviving pupil of Ibn Ishāq died in 201/816 this date provides the end limit for the second teacher-pupil group. A dating based on a later teacher-pupil group is excluded not only by the fact that the manuscript is on good papyrus but by its paleography and by other scribal practices which are apparent in it.

Khaṭīb states that Ibn Ishāq's originals were written on papyrus.⁶ His pupils no doubt used the same material, possibly with paper supplementation coming later in their careers when the paper of Khurāsān was rapidly supplanting parchment and papyrus in 'Irāq.⁷ By the end of the second/eighth century paper was being manufactured in Baghdād and used even for fine Qur'āns, while its use for

¹ Cf. *GAL* I 135.

² Ibn Sa'd VII 2, pp. 68, 83; Khaṭīb VI 81.

³ See Khaṭīb IV 393–96, esp. p. 395; Sam'ānī, folio 579b.

⁴ *Ma'ārīf*, p. 247.

⁵ See *ibid.*; Khaṭīb I 226; *Irshād* VI 399. For Marzabānī see Khaṭīb III 135 f.

⁶ Khaṭīb I 221. Maṣṣūr's chancellery had a large stock of papyrus on hand (see *KPA*, p. 22 and references

there cited).

⁷ The increased use of paper in the last quarter of the 2d/8th century did not put an immediate end to the use of papyrus in 'Irāq for documents and correspondence. References to the use of papyrus for such purposes are met with throughout the 3d/9th century (see *KPA*, p. 22 and references there cited; Grohmann, *From the World of Arabic Papyri*, p. 26).

literary works had spread west to Syria, as evidenced by the recently discovered paper manuscript of the *Arabian Nights*.¹ In other words, a lengthy papyrus manuscript of fair quality from 'Irāq would have to date at the latest from the last quarter of the second/eighth century. The only instance known to the present writer confirms the continued use of papyrus for literary purposes at this time in 'Irāq. This is a *Musnad* collected and composed by 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Madīnī (161-234/777-848) evidently while he was still young. Upon his return to 'Irāq after a three-year trip to the Yemen, he found that his papyrus manuscript, *qirṭās*, had been destroyed by the action of damp earth and he had not the heart to rewrite it.²

As for the paleographic evidence provided by our papyrus text, attention is drawn to the description of the script on page 80. The comparative angularity, the rarity of diacritical points, and the division of words, including even "Allāh," at the ends of lines are indicative of practices largely antedating the first appearance of calligraphic schools in the province of 'Irāq, under the leadership of Quṭbah (d. 154/771) and Ishāq ibn Ḥammād in the period covering the reigns of Maṣṣūr and Maḥdī (136-69/754-785).³ Other internal evidence in favor of this general period is the inconsistency in respect to the formula calling down blessings on Muḥammad. At times it is omitted (recto 12 and verso 11), but when it is used both the shorter version (recto 11 and verso 1) and the longer form (recto 7 and verso 9, 10, 11 f.) occur. In early manuscripts, as in Document No. 4 above (see p. 63), there is no marked effort at uniformity in such respects. In some the formula is omitted completely, as was permitted by Ibn Ḥanbal and as illustrated by Document No. 5 in the present study (see p. 74).⁴ The earliest known example of the use of abbreviation devices for the formula in writing is seen in *PERF* No. 789, dated 253/867.

To Fück's list of Ibn Ishāq's fifteen pupils (see p. 87 with n. 5) should be added three more, including two judges:⁵ the famous Abū Yūsuf (113-82/731-98),⁶ pupil and friend of Abū Ḥanīfah and favorite of Maḥdī and Hārūn al-Rashīd, and the Kūfan Ḥusain ibn Ḥasan al-'Awfī (d. 201 or 202/816 or 817).⁷ The third additional pupil is the scholar Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī, whose family provided several other pupils for the master.⁸ It is not to be expected that all of the eighteen pupils were similarly or equally motivated. The integration of relevant biographical materials with the increasingly available information on the earliest manuscript techniques in the fundamental science

¹ The first paper factories of Baghdād were established in the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd. See *OIP* L 53 and references there cited, also "A ninth-century fragment of the 'Thousand Nights,'" *JNES* VIII 144-49, esp. p. 147, nn. 31-33, where attention is drawn to the controversy on the date of the first paper factory in Baghdād. Grohmann in his recent *From the World of Arabic Papyri*, pp. 26 and 53, has abandoned Karabacek's point of view to accept Mez's position. The present writer intends to devote an article to the clarification of the issue in the near future.

² Khaṭīb XI 458-73, esp. p. 462; cf. the writer's "An Arabic papyrus in the Oriental Institute," *JNES* V 169, n. 3, where "of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal" should be deleted and "Khaṭīb . . . IX" corrected to "Khaṭīb . . . XI"; see also *Mizān* II 229-31, which throws some light on Ibn al-Madīnī's suspected orthodoxy. The Caliph Muṭasim attempted in 221/836 to introduce papyrus culture and manufacture into his new capital, Sāmarrā', by importing the plant and the artisans from Egypt. The plant did not do well, and the venture failed; see Ya'qūbī II 577 and his *Kitāb al-buldān* in *BGA* VII (2d ed.) 253. See also Karabacek, *Das arabische Papier: Eine historisch-antiquarische Untersuchung* (Wien, 1887) p. 98; Grohmann, *From the World of Arabic Papyri*,

pp. 26, 32.

³ *Fihrist*, p. 7; cf. the writer's "Arabic paleography," *Ars Islamica* VIII 87 f. and references there cited.

⁴ The origin of the formula dates back to Muḥammad (Sūrah 33:56). Oral use became general quite early, but use in writing was slower to take hold, particularly outside the field of Tradition proper and especially under the Umayyads. Under the 'Abbāsids its use increased, characterized at first by lack of uniformity, becoming more or less general in the 3d century and compulsory by the 5th. The best study of this subject is still Goldziher's "Über die Eulogien der Muhammedaner," *ZDMG* L (1896) 97-128, to whose sources should be added Ṭaḥāwī, *Mushkil al-athār* (Ḥaidarābād, 1333) III 71-79. The literary papyri studied so far provide remarkable confirmation, on the whole, of results arrived at from considerably later sources, much to the credit of the latter (cf. Rosenthal, *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship*, pp. 12 f.).

⁵ Khaṭīb XIV 133.

⁶ Ibn Sa'd VII 2, pp. 73 f.; Khaṭīb XIV 246-62, esp. pp. 242, 247, 258.

⁷ Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 74.

⁸ E.g. Khaṭīb IX 470 f.; Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 81; *Mizān* III 290.

of *ḥadīth* makes it possible to group Ibn Ishāq's pupils in three ascending categories. Those of the largest group apparently were content with merely *hearing* the master. They may or may not have taken down some memoranda. This technique constituted the earliest and simplest form of the *sam'* or oral session with the master. The transmissions must have been primarily oral and perhaps selective. In competition with written texts, which were rapidly becoming the rule, such transmissions were likely to be soon neglected and lost. The pupils of the second group seem to have had professional objectives but for some reason or another, perhaps lack of opportunity or poor hearing, did *not* begin with hearing the master in person. Instead, they copied his work from authenticated written sources and presented their written manuscripts for checking, correction, and approval, a process that came to be known under the technical term '*arḍ*'. The pupils of the third group started by hearing the master, like those in the first group, but proceeded further to produce written copies either from the master's own dictation or from authenticated written sources. This method constituted a progressive step in the professional *sam'* technique proper. But as an added precaution the pupils presented their manuscript to the teacher for correction and approval, thus combining the *sam'* and '*arḍ*' methods to produce the best and most authoritative text, though the process was still termed *sam'*. In other words, the *sam'* technique evolved in three steps, the last two of which were professionally superior to the simple '*arḍ*' procedure alone. Furthermore, in both the simple '*arḍ*' and the complex *sam'* the presentation of the manuscript to the master for final correction and approval could be done in one of three ways: first, by correcting the manuscript from a *second* recitation by the master either from memory or from his own master copy; second, by reading the manuscript back to the master and making corrections indicated by the latter either from memory or from his own manuscript; third, by collating the manuscript with an authenticated manuscript under the master's personal supervision.¹

We shall not be much concerned here with the first of these three groups of pupils, since little that is specific is known about their transmissions. Perhaps they are best represented by the father-and-son team 'Abd Allāh ibn Numair (115-99/733-814) and his son Muḥammad (d. 234/848), who seem to have favored oral transmission, particularly Muḥammad, who was never seen with a book.² Known representatives of the second group are the judge Abū Yūsuf and Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī (114-94/732-810), both of whom received the *Maghāzī* through the '*arḍ*' method. In contrast to these and representative of the third group are the judge Ḥusain ibn Ḥasan al-'Awfī and Yaḥyā's brother Muḥammad, both of whom received the *Maghāzī* through the initial *sam'* method, that is, they started by hearing it directly from Ibn Ishāq and ended by producing a written and authenticated text, though the specific manner of authentication is not indicated in their case.³ No doubt others of Ibn Ishāq's pupils who are quoted as transmitting his works belong to this group. But the method of

¹ Cf. Bukhārī I 24-27; *Ma'ārif*, pp. 93 f., 102 f., 365 f.; Ḥākim, *Kitāb ma'rifat 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, pp. 256-61; Khaṭīb, *Kifāyah*, pp. 237-44. No exhaustive and up-to-date study exists on the step-by-step evolution of scholarly techniques in the early and basic field of Tradition. Goldziher (*Studien* II 188-202) still presents the best guide to a general outline history of these practices, though '*arḍ*' is barely touched (p. 221, n. 1). Rosenthal, in his commendable monograph *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship*, has no clear cut delimitation either for the historical periods or for the several fields of scholarship. Furthermore, he relies mostly on quite late sources for his chief guides, so that much of his detailed description reflects primarily later practices in the several fields of Islāmic scholarship (cf. e.g. his pp. 25 and 27 f. for collation). In the field of Tradition, as in all other fields and phases of Islāmic history and culture, the lack of adequate firsthand literary materials from the 2d century of Islām and the

almost total absence of such materials from the 1st century has led at times to top-heavy theories based on slim conjecture. Early Arabic literary papyri hold the key to a fresh approach and a more solid foundation for the history and interpretation of any phase of early Islamic culture. But until more such papyri are available, the foundational period will continue to suffer comparative neglect to the detriment of all Islāmic studies covering this period and later periods. As Rosenthal has suggested in the introduction to his recent work, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, which, like his *Technique*, suffers from this very neglect of the foundational period, it may be several more generations before modern Islāmic scholarship, a comparative newcomer in the West, is placed firmly and squarely on a solid foundation.

² Ibn Sa'd VI 274; *Fihrist*, p. 93; Yāqūt VI 401; Dhahabī I 299, II 24 f.

³ Khaṭīb XIV 133.

initial reception and final authentication is indicated for at least two of his pupils, perhaps the most gifted, who went this last step with the master. They are Ziyād ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Bakka'ī (d. 183/799), who transmitted the *Sīrah* to Ibn Hishām,¹ and Salamah ibn al-Faḍl (d. 191/807), on whose transmission Ṭabarī relied for the bulk of his materials from all of Ibn Ishāq's several works.² Both pupils heard the master *twice*,³ which means that they combined the best features of the *sam'* and *'ard* techniques of transmission described above.

It is to be noted that these details of transmission are specified only in connection with the *Maghāzī*. The sources nowhere specify how the *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* was transmitted from Ibn Ishāq to his pupils. But the possibility exists that a given pupil would have used the same method of transmission for both the *Maghāzī* and the *Ta'rikh*. The only name specifically associated with the transmission of the *Ta'rikh* is that of Umawī,⁴ but with no indication as to which of three Umawī brothers is meant, Yaḥyā or Muḥammad or a third brother, 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī (d. ca. 203/818). The probability is in favor of either of the first two as against the third, since 'Abd Allāh's interests centered mainly on subjects other than Tradition and history proper.⁵ Of the other two, Yaḥyā⁶ seems to be much better known to the biographers and historians than Muḥammad, which fact in itself is not decisive in the present case. However, Yāqūt's entry on Ibn Ishāq mentions the name Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī in full in connection with the *Maghāzī* and at another point speaks simply of Umawī as the transmitter of the *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'*. These passages would seem to indicate that Yāqūt identified the transmitter of the *Ta'rikh* as Yaḥyā.⁷

The only other pupil whose name is linked with the *Ta'rikh* is the above-mentioned Salamah ibn al-Faḍl, in the passage from Khaṭīb, already discussed above, which associates the Caliph Manṣūr with the inception of the *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* in his order for a history down to the author's own time.⁸ According to this account Ibn Ishāq gave the entire set of his originals, written on papyrus, to Salamah. This could have happened only toward the end of Ibn Ishāq's life. At any rate, Salamah's transmission was preferred to that of any other because of his possession of the originals. Ṭabarī both confirms and supplements the biographers in such a way as to make it abundantly clear not only that Salamah definitely transmitted the *Ta'rikh* along with the rest of Ibn Ishāq's works, but that his transmission was the one consistently used by Ṭabarī himself. For Ṭabarī rarely draws on Yaḥyā⁹ or even on Ziyād ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'ī¹⁰ for any of Ibn Ishāq's materials, while he leans heavily on Salamah's transmission for all of them,¹¹ so much so that Yāqūt states that "Ṭabarī erected his own history on Ibn Ishāq's *Mubtadā'* and *Maghāzī'*" as transmitted by Salamah.¹² Ṭabarī himself received these materials not directly from Salamah, who had passed on before Ṭabarī's time, but through *two* separate but contemporary transmitters from Salamah, namely Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Dūlābī (d. post-256/post-869) and Muḥammad ibn Ḥamīd (d. 248/862), particularly through the latter, whose transmission Ṭabarī seems to have much preferred.¹³ Ṭabarī's all but complete reliance on Salamah's transmission could mean one of two things. Either Ṭabarī exercised his own judgment on several

¹ *Sīrah*, p. 3; Khaṭīb VIII 476 f.; *Mizān* I 357.

² See Ṭabarī, Index, under Salamah ibn al-Faḍl; *Irshād* VI 430; *Mizān* I 407.

³ Khaṭīb VIII 476 f.; *Mizān* I 407.

⁴ *Fihrist*, p. 92; *Irshād* VI 401.

⁵ *Fihrist*, pp. 48, 88; Khaṭīb IX 470 f. His field was linguistics and witticisms (*nawādir*).

⁶ Ibn Sa'd VI, pp. 277 f., VII 2, p. 81; Khaṭīb XIV 132–35; Dhahabī I 298; *Mizān* I 290. Yaḥyā's son Sa'īd continued the written transmission of the *Maghāzī* (see Khaṭīb X 113 f.).

⁷ See *Irshād* VI 400 f.

⁸ Khaṭīb I 221; see pp. 89 ff. above.

⁹ Ṭabarī I 269, 1222, 1598, 1652, 1767, III 2533; Yaḥyā does not provide any *Ta'rikh* materials.

¹⁰ Ṭabarī I 3453. See also Ṭabarī, Index, under these names for the few citations from others than Ibn Ishāq.

¹¹ See Ṭabarī's Index for long list of citations. The materials from the *Ta'rikh* begin with Ṭabarī I 1829.

¹² *Irshād* VI 430. This statement is largely borne out by Ṭabarī's work. Note that Yāqūt does *not* mention the *Ta'rikh* of Ibn Ishāq here, and certainly Ṭabarī's section on the history of the caliphs is not so heavily indebted to Ibn Ishāq.

¹³ Cf. *Irshād* VI 430 and Ṭabarī, Index, under both names. For Muḥammad ibn Ḥamīd see Khaṭīb II 259–64, esp. pp. 262 f.; Dhahabī II 67 f.; *Mizān* I 407, III 49 f. Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād does not seem to have attracted biographers' attention. His approximate death

transmissions available to him and selected that of Salamah as the best; or he had little choice in the matter, Salamah's transmission being the only one available to him. The latter case would imply that Salamah's transmission had already crowded out the others in the eastern provinces of the empire. Thus in either case Ṭabarī's practice confirms Khaṭīb's explicit statement that Salamah's transmission was the generally preferred one. What better reason could there be for this marked preference than the equally explicit statement that Salamah possessed the master's original autograph copies?

The indications being what they are so far, it becomes increasingly clear that of the papyrus manuscripts which originated in 'Irāq at this time the most likely to have survived are those associated with Ibn Ishāq himself and his two pupils Yaḥyā and Salamah. This category covers Ibn Ishāq's originals, the two pupils' personal copies, and copies made from any one of the three under the supervision of either Yaḥyā or Salamah early in their careers as teachers, since paper was rapidly replacing papyrus in the last decades of their lives. This qualification narrows the probable date limits to about the middle third of the second century and certainly not beyond the third quarter of the same century, that is, the last quarter of the eighth century of our era.

It is necessary to turn once more to the internal evidence of the Oriental Institute papyrus. The transmission and scribal techniques ascertainable from the folio exclude the possibility that it represents Ibn Ishāq's original copy of the *Ta'rikh*. Again, they are inconclusive as to a choice between a copy originating with Yaḥyā or Salamah or one of their pupils.

The evidence in question lies in the scribal errors and their correction and in the marginal notations. The folio presents only six scribal errors. Three of these are wrong or miswritten words that were discovered and corrected, as the copy was being made, by a neat line run through them (recto 5, 14 and verso 17). The remaining three are omissions, two of which were discovered later and inserted between the lines (recto 14 and verso 3) while the third was overlooked even in the process of rechecking or collation (recto 4; see Comments on recto 4-6). Though it could be argued that these errors and their correction could have been made either while the text was being written down from dictation or while it was being copied from written sources, the marginal notations indicate only the latter possibility. The first of these notations appears at the beginning of the section and consists of a rough circle inclosing the word *naskhat*, "copy." Below this but *outside* the circle is the word *al-awwal*, "the first." It is not quite clear to what "the first" refers. Were it inside the circle it could be taken to mean that this is the first copy to be made. As it is, it was more likely meant to indicate actually the first paragraph of the text being copied. The five other marginal notations indicate each new item beginning with *qāla Ibn Ishāq*, "Ibn Ishāq said." Each notation is inclosed in a circle and consists of the phrase *nusikha minhu*, "copied from it," with the preposition being written now above now below the verb. Finally, there is a fuller notation running across a good part of the upper margin of the recto, كل خط عليه طلبت فقد وقع, "Every notation required of me has been written down," which quite obviously was intended to refer to notations made throughout the manuscript. Close examination of the ink and the script of the corrections and marginal notations clearly identifies these with the ink and the script of the main text, the script of the former being only on a smaller scale than that of the main text.

These facts are extremely interesting in the light of our knowledge of early manuscript techniques as ascertained so far through literary sources. For they make possible the identification of the present manuscript as a copy made from and collated with either the *aṣl*, that is, the written copy, of either Salamah or Yaḥyā or the *aṣl al-aṣl*, that is, the original autograph copy, of Ibn Ishāq himself. The 'ard or collation was obviously made under the supervision of one of the three masters—Ibn Ishāq,

date is based on Ṭabarī III 1831, n. o. However, his son Muḥammad (224-310/838-923) migrated to Egypt about 260/873, where his occupation was that of *warrāq* or publisher and bookseller (cf. Sam'ānī, folio

233b; Dhahabī II 291 f.). As a bookseller, Muḥammad must have realized that manuscripts from the eastern provinces would find a good market in Egypt.

Yaḥyā, or Salamah—who had indicated the corrections and notations to be made as the final step in rendering the manuscript transmission as fully authentic and authoritative as possible.

III

The papyrus text, brief as it is, adds something to our knowledge and comprehension of the first decades of Islām. For the most part it provides remarkable confirmation of historical data that have come down through later sources. It adds the weight of “the *earliest* authority available” on controversial questions, even though it is in no position to solve them. This is fully illustrated in the question of whether or not Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was included in the elective council, as already pointed out in the Comments on recto 8–15 and verso 16–17.

But even more interesting is the new setting it gives to the text of verso 7–13. As already stated in the “Comments,” Miqdād is nowhere else in the sources associated directly with the passage. Neither does the passage itself appear in any of the sources in connection with ‘Uthmān at the time of the elective council. Wāqidī, in a composite and fuller account, reports a similar passage but in an entirely different setting. According to him, sometime in the reign of ‘Umar, and for some unstated reason, words passed between ‘Uthmān and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, whereupon the latter sent Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah, ‘Uthmān’s uterine brother, with the following message to ‘Uthmān: “I was present at Badr and you were not, I stood fast at Uḥud and you fled, and I was at the Oath of al-Raḍwān and you were not.” ‘Uthmān sent Walīd back with a reply in defense of himself, quoted in the first person in much the same terms as the papyrus text, but with a few elaborations, which defense ‘Abd al-Raḥmān accepted as adequate. Wāqidī then adds, without, however, indicating whether or not the occasion is the same, that ‘Umar while looking at ‘Uthmān said, “He was verily one of those whom God forgave once and for all.”¹

Ibn Ḥanbal provides a parallel passage set definitely in the reign of ‘Uthmān himself. Walīd approached ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf with the statement, “I see that you have withdrawn from the Commander of the Faithful, ‘Uthmān,” to which ‘Abd al-Raḥmān answered, “Tell him (‘Uthmān) from me, ‘I did not flee the Day of Uḥud, I did not stay away the Day of Badr, and I did not abandon the example of ‘Umar.’” Walīd delivered the message and came back with ‘Uthmān’s answer as follows, “As for his (‘Abd al-Raḥmān) saying ‘I did not flee the Day of Uḥud,’ how can he reproach me with a fault that God Himself has forgiven saying: ‘As for those of you who turned away on the day when the two hosts met, it was Satan who sought to trip them up for something they had earned; God has overlooked their offence.’² And as for his saying, ‘I did not stay away the Day of Badr,’ I was nursing Ruqqiyah, the daughter of the Messenger of God, at the time of her death. The Messenger of God allotted me my share (of the spoils), and he to whom the Messenger of God allotted his share was (counted as) present. And as for his saying, ‘I did not abandon the example of ‘Umar,’ I am not equal to it and neither is he.”³

On still another occasion—obviously toward the troubled end of ‘Uthmān’s reign, when the Egyptians were demanding his abdication—‘Uthmān’s three shortcomings formed the subject of conversation between an unnamed Egyptian and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb (d. 74/693), who rose to the defense of the caliph.⁴ Finally, according to a brief report tacked on to Wāqidī’s account, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar had at least one more occasion to defend ‘Uthmān for some of these shortcomings, even after the murder of that caliph.⁵

¹ Wāqidī, pp. 272 f. (= Wellhausen, p. 130).

² Sūrah 3:155; cf. Bell I 60, verse 149.

³ Ibn Ḥanbal I 68. The tradition traces back to Shaqīq ibn Salamah (d. 82/701); cf. Dhahabī I 56.

⁴ This account, frequently met with, is nevertheless a singleton report that traces back to ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mauhab, an obscure traditionist of

Medina (cf. Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad*, p. 264, No. 1908; Ibn Ḥanbal II 101, 120; Bukhārī II 430 f., III 83; Ṭabarī I 1793). ‘Uthmān, when besieged, cited his role at Raḍwān among his assets (cf. *Iṣābah* III 1103–06). For an account of the siege, see the present writer’s *Aishah*, pp. 115–18.

⁵ Wāqidī, p. 273.

Taken together, these several instances, along with the papyrus text, leave little doubt that 'Uthmān's classic shortcomings rose to plague him on several occasions. What is of interest here is the role assigned to 'Abd al-Raḥmān on two of these occasions. What is known of his character would hardly place him in the unfavorable light of having at one time accepted 'Uthmān's defense and yet coming back to the attack. Quite obviously there is here a confusion of occasions, with the earlier incident being split into two with all the involvement of terms and the forms of direct and indirect speech. It is quite possible that up to the last years of 'Umar's reign there was some latent rivalry between 'Uthmān and 'Abd al-Raḥmān, both wealthy, generous, and influential participants in the public affairs of the new Islāmic community and state. 'Uthmān was a willing caliphal candidate throughout the period. 'Abd al-Raḥmān had his supporters too, though he himself disavowed such ambitions. Still, he did not withdraw at the start from the elective council and at the end he traded his withdrawal for no less a role than that of caliph-maker. Under these circumstances it is not inconceivable that at some time in 'Umar's reign cross words passed between the two and led to the exchange of messages as recorded by Wāqidī. Again, it is well known that as 'Uthmān's misrule progressed 'Abd al-Raḥmān was taken to task for having chosen him in the first place. To this accusation 'Abd al-Raḥmān would reply that he did so only because 'Uthmān had promised to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor. In the end the disappointed and embarrassed 'Abd al-Raḥmān swore he would never again speak to 'Uthmān, and he kept this oath until his death (32/652). It is in this period and in this setting that Ibn Ḥanbal's account must find its place and occasion. Thus, it would make more sense if it were limited to the statement that 'Abd al-Raḥmān was neglecting or even criticizing 'Uthmān because the latter had failed to keep his promise to be guided by 'Umar's example.¹

Apart from the significance of its contents as such, the papyrus presents direct evidence of Ibn Ishāq's historical method, free from the influence of subsequent transmitters and abridgers. He uses the *isnād*, though not consistently. He combines two or more short reports on a small group of related items, thus, on the one hand, avoiding a disjointed series of single traditions on separate items and, on the other hand, stopping short of a long continuous narrative. He is quite selective in his direct quotations and expert at abridging lengthy individual accounts. If this single folio is typical of the whole, he selected his sources carefully, using for the most part well known authorities of the Kūfan school (see p. 90). As to his coverage of the themes, again if this folio is typical, it confirms the long-suspected brevity of the *Ta'rīkh al-khulafā'*, though it is clear that brevity was not achieved at the expense of either adequacy or clarity. The author laid his finger on every important issue and personality involved. His men are in character, as judged from other sources. The rivalry and tension of the various candidates for and aspirants to the caliphate are expressed in the vigorous speech common to the forthright Arab of the day. To write on such themes at the time of the first flush of Persian influence under the 'Abbāsīd dynasty while he was under the very patronage of the latter called for both restraint and courage. Restraint is shown in the simple mention of Abū Lu'lu'ah, the Persian assassin of the Arab Caliph 'Umar. Courage is displayed in the full record of the respective claims of 'Alī and 'Uthmān to favorable consideration at the hands of the elective council and of the new Islāmic community. The account, so far as it goes in our fragment, gives no inkling of partiality for either of these two major candidates and hence calls into question the accusation that Ibn Ishāq favored the Shī'ite religio-political party.²

If such is the character of the *Ta'rīkh al-khulafā'*, its subsequent neglect cannot be fully accounted for by the simple fact of its brevity. There is still the possibility that the *Ta'rīkh* was not completed, as first planned, down to the author's own day.³ Ṭabarī's citations of *Ta'rīkh* materials do not seem to extend beyond the reign of Mu'āwiyah. However, Ṭabarī's immediate oral source for the *Ta'rīkh*, Muḥammad ibn Ḥamīd, died in 248/862, while Ṭabarī (225-310/833-923) was still quite young and possibly before he had finished acquiring the entire *Ta'rīkh* from him, particularly through the *sam'*

¹ Cf. *Aishah*, pp. 106 f. and references there cited, other heresies (see Khaṭīb I 225 f.).
esp. *Ansāb* V 57.

³ See Horovitz in *Islamic Culture* II 182.

² Cf. *Irshād* VI 400. Ibn Ishāq was also accused of

method. Ṭabarī himself worked on his lengthy history almost to the end of his life. But in such a circumstance Ṭabarī would have sought other transmitters, if not indeed Muḥammad ibn Ḥamīd's manuscript. This line of thought leads back to the fact of the neglect of the *Ta'rikh* without adding anything to the solution of the problem of its scope. Nevertheless, in the light of our present knowledge of the over-all background of the origin and transmission of the work, it is possible to suggest, at least tentatively, a probable explanation of its obscurity. This lies in the interplay of a series of facts and conditions. The *Ta'rikh* had, from the start, only a very limited number of transmitters. These and the next generation of pupils were stationed and for the most part were stationary in the eastern provinces of the empire. The ready availability in these same provinces, particularly in 'Irāq itself, of the fuller source materials on which Ibn Ishāq himself had drawn helped to crowd out the few available transmissions of the *Ta'rikh*. This is amply illustrated in the case of 'Amr ibn Maimūn, who has been repeatedly detected in the present study as Ibn Ishāq's ultimate source and whose lengthy account of the themes of the present papyrus were fully and directly utilized by historians from Wāqidī and Ibn Sa'd to Ibn al-Athīr and by such leading traditionists as Ibn Ḥanbal and Bukhārī.¹ The neglected manuscripts of the *Ta'rikh*—papyrus or paper—soon disintegrated and were lost, rendering the work unknown except by title from the late third century onward. Only such manuscripts as had the good fortune to find lodging in Egypt, as the present manuscript quite obviously did, had a chance for survival.

Whether or not the present manuscript found its way into Egypt in the company of Ibn Hishām, who alone is responsible for what has survived of the rest of Ibn Ishāq's works, is hard to say. Though he had the opportunity, while he was still in 'Irāq, to acquire the *Ta'rikh* either from one of the Umawī brothers or from Salamah ibn Fadl, there is no direct evidence that he did so. Of Ibn Hishām's known pupils and transmitters in Egypt the three Barqī brothers are associated with his *Sīrah* and its *Maghāzī* subdivision. It is through one of these brothers, 'Abd al-Raḥīm al-Barqī, that the extant text of Ibn Hishām's *Sīrah* has come down to us.² This family would no doubt have been interested in any work of Ibn Ishāq that found its way into Egypt in the third century. The *riḥlah* or travel in search of knowledge was on the increase. Among those who traveled from 'Irāq to Egypt was Muḥammad al-Warrāq, bookseller son of Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Dūlābī.³ The latter, it will be recalled, was one of the two transmission links between Salamah and Ṭabarī for the *Mubtadā'* and *Maghāzī* of Ibn Ishāq (see p. 94). Finally, Ṭabarī himself visited Egypt in 253/867 and 256/870.⁴ The 'Irāqī manuscript of the *Ta'rikh* had a good chance of getting to Egypt in the company of one of these travelers.

The question naturally arises at this point whether the present papyrus might not have originated in third-century Egypt after all. The answer is negative because of the comparatively primitive paleography of the piece and the scribal practices noted above. The script stands apart from that of the three dozen other literary papyri, presumably from second- and third-century Egypt, that are under study. More than a dozen of these are collections of *ḥadīth* proper, and none gives any evidence of the techniques of transmission indicated in the present papyrus. The latter fact in itself points to 'Irāq as the original home of our papyrus, for these methods developed earlier in 'Irāq than in Egypt.

This single papyrus folio has yielded a harvest rich beyond the most optimistic expectations of a decade or two back. It has brought to light the long-lost *Ta'rikh al-khulafā'* in a fragment that takes an honored place among the very few extant manuscripts of the second century of Islām, the earliest of their kind yet known. Its text sheds interesting side lights on Islām's earliest leading personalities and their political ambitions. It gives the first direct illustration of the historical method of Ibn Ishāq and his circle. It provides the first tangible evidence of the advanced scholarship and manuscript techniques

¹ Cf. Ṭahāwī, *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyah*, pp. 405–8, for Bukhārī's dependence on 'Amr ibn Maimūn for the account of the murder of 'Umar. Among other likely sources of early 'Irāqī compositions one might mention 'Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam and his history of Mu'āwiyah and the Umayyad dynasty (see p. 86 above), the works of the two Kalbīs, Abū Mikhnaḥ, Wāqidī, and Madā'inī

(cf. *Irshād* VI 441).

² *Sīrah* II xliii f.; Yāqūt I 574; Dhahabī II 134 f. For the Barqī brothers see p. 63 above.

³ Dhahabī II 291 f.; *Irshād* VI 430; see also p. 94, n. 13, above.

⁴ *Irshād* VI 432, 434.

of the second half of the second century of Islām. Furthermore, though itself from the field of history, it nevertheless provides significant evidence of the early development of these techniques in the field of *ḥadīth* proper, with which history shared some of its best methods of professional transmission, oral and written (see pp. 7 ff.). Finally, in its confirmation of such an early development of the careful techniques that combined writing with the *ṣam'* and *'arḍ*, it restores confidence in third-century and later sources that bear on these themes. These sources describe these techniques as current in the time of Zuhri, the teacher of Ibn Ishāq. They trace back their development in the first century through the practices of 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, the first historian of Islām, and of the editorial committee for the standard 'Uthmānic Qur'ān, and credit their origin to the nebulous but highly suggestive practices and claims of Muḥammad himself. These are themes to be further developed in Volume II of this series, a study of a group of early *ḥadīth* papyri.

Once more a fragmentary literary papyrus and the research it entailed contribute something tangible to our knowledge of early Islāmic history and culture as these evolved in the comparatively obscure first and second centuries of Islām, the seventh and eighth centuries of our era.

THE *DHIKR AL-NABĪ* OF IBN 'UQDAH
ZAIDITE HISTORY OF THE PROPHET AND HIS FAMILY

Oriental Institute No. 17638. Late third/ninth century to early fourth/tenth century.

Medium quality medium brown papyrus, 15.8 × 22.2 cm., with 17 lines to the page as is. The papyrus is broken at the top, but, since the verso is written upside down in relation to the recto, the text is continuous. The piece is much damaged.

Script.—Common cursive hand (see p. 4). Diacritical points are freely used for all letters, though not throughout the piece. Of the letters that need no points, *sin* frequently has a stroke above it to distinguish it from *shin*, which is sometimes dotted and sometimes not so. 'Ain has a miniature 'ain placed below it in recto 2 to distinguish it from *ghain*, which itself is not always written with a dot. This usage appears also in *PERF* No. 864, which dates from the third century. No punctuation marks are used.

TEXT

RECTO

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | [وا]سير[ه]م [باقا]مة بيان وامضاهم اذا طعموا نفت سناناً |
| 2 | وادفعهم عن الضراء منهم واثبتهم اذا نطقوا لساناً |
| 3 | فما نضمه لك جملة القول في علي بن ابي طالب رحمه الله انه اطاع الله قبلهم |
| 4 | واطاع الله بعدهم وامتنح بما لم يمتحن به ذو غمم وابتلى بما لم يبتلى به |
| 5 | ذو همم ويحمى عنه ابن عبد الوهاب واخوانه من الطالبية |
| 6 | واشغلهم عنه الكذب واما جملة القول في ولد علي فان |
| 7 | الناس لا يعظمون الناس الا بعد ان ينالوا منهم ويصيبوا من فعلهم |
| 8 | ولا قبل ان ولا يعظمون قبل الاكتساب منهم وهم |
| 9 | رازقون فان ذلك لهم يعد فنون فلولا ان هناك سرا كبيرا لما |
| 10 | رجينا عفاً او فضلاً [قال اي]ان عبد الوهاب [|
| 11 | فان بغا نرا [ذ]لك النكال في الشر [|
| 12 | النطق و[البلاغة] وكيف كان ياتي اليه |
| 13 | الشظى [يوم] عيد الاركان واليه يوم عيد الاطناب وقت |
| 14 | الخطاب والذكر يساعد الذكر وكيف كان كلامه قائماً وقاعداً |
| 15 | الى الجماعات ومنتعه تابع الحدة والاحكام والعلم بالاحلال والحرام |
| 16 | وكيف كان عبد الله بن عباس اليه يجاز فقال له البحر والخبز وبثل به [عمر] |
| 17 | بن الخطاب بقوله يحي عن احمد [بن ا]بي عباس ابن عباس |

VERSO

- 1 [عن عمر بن الخطاب] وكان للفرض قلب عقول ولسان قبول وكان
 2 معجباً بسبل غرباء وكيف كان يقول المنا[ز]عة يوم
 3 المر على الجمر ويوم الانحار ويوم الاطناب المفقه في الدين
 4 العلم التأويل وقالوا ما راينا بقبال محمد قرانا وشفقا
 5 وخيرا قال ع[بد] الله [ابن عباس] فقالوا له ففسير لنا
 6 سوفما . . .]
 7 بالناس وعثمان محصور فتكلم بك[لام]
 8 والسلم فسلمنا وهو صاحب الطائر الابيض ا]
 9 خيرنا و لو لم يكن لجا عنهم الاثنان زيد بن علي بن الحسن
 10 وعبد الله ابو جعفر بن معاوية بن جعفر لفزعوا بهما جميع
 11 البلغاء وعلوا بهما على جميع الخطباء ولذلك قالوا اجواد
 12 الجاد والسنة جواد قد القيت اليك جملة من ذكر
 13 آل الرسول سنقول بالقليل منه على الكثير وبالنقص
 14 عن الكل واتبعته في ذكر الرسول ومنه انك متى
 15 عرفت اخبارهم ومنازل طاعتهم وراتب اعمالهم
 16 واقرار افعالهم وشدة محتتهم علمت انك متى جمعتهم
 17

TRANSLATION

RECTO

- 1 and readiest in establishing a proof, and most long-suffering when pierced by words sharp as an
 arrow,
 2 and foremost in diverting harm (to others) from them (sharp words), and most reliable in their
 utterances.
 3 Among that which we have brought together for you is a summary of the reports about 'Alī ibn
 Abī Ṭālib—God be merciful to him. He obeyed God before they did
 4 and he obeyed God after they (ceased to do so). He was tried as no (other) man of sorrows was
 tried and he was afflicted as no (other)
 5 man of grief was afflicted. Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb and his fellow brothers of the Ṭālibīyah defend
 him (against detractors),
 6 but falsehood has distracted their attention from him (Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb and his defense). As
 to the summary of the report about the descendants of 'Alī, verily
 7 the people do not magnify men except after they receive benefits from them and profit from their
 action
 8 and not before they . . . from them. Nor do they magnify (men) before they gain from them and
 even then only while

- 9 they (the benefited) are (still) weak. For that with them is accounted an art. And were it not that
there is a great mystery in that,
10 we could not hope for self-restraint or grace. Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb said
11 And should he (the tyrant) oppress, we see that as (God's will in) the scourging of the wicked . . .
12 utterance and [. . . (the author is here listing the themes to be covered in the narrative on 'Alī) . . .
and how they came to him]
13 the freedmen and followers on the day of the festival of the pillars and (how they came) to him
on the day of the festival of the tent-robcs and at the time
14 of the oration and of the exhortation to the remembrance of God. And the manner of his delivery,
standing or seated,
15 before the assemblies. And his firmness in following religious practice and the decrees (of God)
and the knowledge of the lawful and the unlawful.
16 And how 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās used to seek his opinion and refer to him as a man of extensive
knowledge and learning. And (how) he was considered exemplary by 'Umar
17 ibn al-Khaṭṭāb in his statement (on the authority of) Yaḥyā on the authority of Aḥmad on the
authority of Abū 'Abbās ibn 'Abbās

VERSO

- 1 [on the authority of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb]: "He ('Alī) was in matters of duty a man with an under-
standing heart and a friendly tongue and
2 he took pleasure in being charitable to many strangers." And how he used to make the proclama-
tion on the day of
3 the passing by the stones and the day of the sacrifice and the day of the tent-robcs. (He was) the
wise in religion (and)
4 the source of exposition. And they said, "We have not seen anyone (except 'Alī who is) comparable
to Muḥammad in friendship, compassion,
5 and goodness." 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās said, "They said to him 'proceed on our behalf
6 perhaps. . . .'" . . .
7 to the people while 'Uthmān was besieged. He spoke with w[ords . . . " . . .]
8 and security, then we will surrender." And he is the bearer of the white banner . . .
9 (and) the best of (all of) us. And had not deliverance been sought from them by the two, Zaid ibn
'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain
10 and 'Abd Allāh Abū Ja'far ibn Mu'āwiyah ibn Ja'far, the aid of both of them would certainly have
been sought by
11 the eloquent, and they would have raised both of them above all orators. That is why they said
(of them) "generous
12 of zeal and with a family tradition of generosity." I have (herewith) placed before you a summary
of the narrative in remembrance
13 of the family of the Messenger (of God). We shall speak briefly rather than at length, stopping
short
14 of completeness. I have appended it to the *Remembrance of the Messenger*. From it, you, when you
shall have
15 known their histories and the degree of their obedience and the order of their deeds
16 and the dutifulness of their acts and the severity of their trials, then you will know that when you
bring these together
17 (The last lines no doubt worked up to a climax in stressing the superiority of 'Alī and his
descendants.)

Comments.—*Recto* 1–2. The practice of describing in superlative terms the family heads and party leaders who were in any way connected with the “people of the house” or the family of Muḥammad began early in Islām and rapidly gained favor, particularly among the different Shī'ite sects.

Recto 4–5. Shī'ite tradition claims that 'Alī's trials and tribulations were early revealed to Muḥammad, who in turn foretold them to 'Alī. The only close parallel to the sense of the papyrus text discovered so far is reported in this connection by Abū Nu'aim I 66 f. To the above-mentioned prophecy this account adds that 'Alī himself will be a source of trials and tribulations to others: انه مبتلى ومبتلى به. A similar sentiment was expressed by the Caliph Manṣūr in 145/762 to the then 'Alid rebel Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh (Ṭabarī III 213 f.; cf. Nabia Abbott, *Two Queens of Baghdad* [Chicago, 1946] pp. 16 f.) Still earlier, 'Alid leaders compared their unhappy lot under the Umayyads to that of the Jews under Pharaoh (see Ibn Sa'd V 69, 162 f.). The papyrus text brings to mind the famous phrase from Isaiah 53:3, “a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,” the Arabic of which reads somewhat clumsily رجل اوجاع ومختبر الحزن e.g. in the Oxford (1890) and the Beirut (1897) editions of the Bible. The practice of comparing 'Alī to Jesus dates back to the first century of Islām (cf. 'Āmilī III 1, p. 161, and see Comments on verso 4–5).

Recto 5–6. It would seem from this passage and *recto* 10 that Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb was a fairly well known partisan. Still, he is not to be found in the usual biographical sources. This fact is in accord with the statement of line 6, namely that Ibn al-Wahhāb and his defense of 'Alī were generally neglected (see also pp. 107–8). For the term “Ṭālibīyah,” see Comments on verso 9–12.

Recto 7–10. This unqualified estimate of man's self-seeking nature and the worldly cunning he displays in achieving his personal ends is intended to dramatize the purpose it serves in the “great mystery” of ethics and morality.

Recto 11. Interesting is this echo of the ancient and familiar concept that a tyrant is an instrument of God for the punishment of a wicked and erring people. That the innocent must suffer with the guilty is tacitly accepted as part of the great mystery referred to in the preceding lines. The tyrants or evil-doers, stated or implied in the lost portion of the text, must include at least Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and the first two 'Abbāsīd caliphs.

Recto 12–15. The author's list of the themes to be treated in connection with 'Alī may have started in the lost section of *recto* 11. It continues to verso 9. There seems to be an echo of the phrase وكيف وكان in the account of 'Alī in Abū Nu'aim I 68–72, where every new theme has a brief heading starting with وكان.

'Alī's leadership at public meetings and in the ceremonies of the Ḥajj Pilgrimage is met with in the standard *manāqib* and *faḍā'il* literature in the sections that deal with the virtues and merits of Muḥammad and his Companions (e.g. Bukhārī II 434–36; Muslim XV 173 f.; Tirmidhī XIII 172 f.; Abū Nu'aim I 61–87). The traditions on these themes increase with time. 'Alī's eloquence is dramatized in the collection of his letters and speeches presented under the title *Nahj al-balāghah* or *Voice of Eloquence* (see *Nahj al-balāghah*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abduh [Cairo, n.d.]; Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ nahj al-balāghah* [Cairo, 1329] I 7 f.). It is believed that this collection was compiled by Sharīf al-Raḍī (A.D. 970–1015) or his brother Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (A.D. 966–1044); see *GAL* I 82, 405 and *S* I 705; Jamil Sultan, *Étude sur Nahj al-balāgha* (Paris, 1940).

The festivals and ceremonies mentioned in lines 13–14 are all associated with the Ḥajj. Making the rounds of the pillars of the Mosque at Mecca, kissing some of them, pitching and folding tents, listening to sermons and exhortations were and are among the activities of the busy days of the Ḥajj. References to most of these are to be found in the standard collections of traditions under the headings “Ḥajj” and “Manāsik” (see Bukhārī I 406 f.; Muslim VIII 13 f.; Mālik, *Al-muwaffa'* [Cairo, 1921] I 93, 179 ff., 209).

Recto 15–17. For the derived meaning of الحدة as used in the translation see Lane, art. حَدَّ, subentry حِدَّة. 'Alī's wisdom and learning stand high among his virtues according to his followers,

who frequently quote, in addition to Muḥammad, 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās in support of their statements (see p. 82, lines 9–11). It should be pointed out that 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās himself had a high reputation for these qualities and that 'Umar and others are quoted as describing him in almost the same terms that are here applied to 'Alī in these and the following lines (cf. Abū Nu'aim I 316, 318; Khaṭīb I 173–75; and Comments on verso 1–2). For a suspect collection of 'Alī's wise sayings see *Nahj al-balāghah* III 152–266.

Recto 17. This *isnād* is doubly faulty in that it does not give the full names of the transmitters or definitely indicate an unbroken chain of transmission. Such devices were familiar among the weak or false traditionists, though the Shī'ah are more frequently accused of using them. 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, equally well known as Ibn 'Abbās, is seldom cited by his *kunya*, Abū 'Abbās, as he is in the papyrus text. His son 'Alī (d. 117/735) had among his own sons one named Yaḥyā and another named Aḥmad, whose death dates are nowhere indicated. However, several of this 'Alī's sons lived into the second half of the second century, and these two may have been among them. It is possible that we have here another more or less suspect device of the traditionist—the family *isnād*. If so, then the present *isnād* should read clearly and fully “Yaḥyā ibn 'Alī on the authority of his brother Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās.” For these descendants of 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās see Zambaur, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam* (Hanovre, 1927) Table G. Other *isnād* possibilities will be discussed below.

Verso 1–2. No definite parallel to these lines has come to light so far. However, interesting variations occur in the sources. 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib himself is reported as saying *ان الله وهب لي قلبا وهدب لي لسانا* *سؤولا*, thus leading the way for others to refer to him as having the qualities mentioned (cf. Abū Nu'aim I 61, 67 f.). But 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and others are quoted as applying the same terms to 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās as pupil of 'Alī (see Abū Nu'aim I 316, 318; 'Āmilī I, p. 260, III 3, p. 34). Being friendly (*قبول*) and willing to ask for information or favor (*سؤول*) are no doubt meant to indicate 'Alī's basic humility, which rendered him happy to aid and serve the strangers within his reach (see *Nahj al-balāghah* III 204).

Verso 2–4. Cf. 'Āmilī III 1, pp. 88–94, 172 f.; see also Comments on recto 12–17 and references there cited. Note the absence of the formula of blessing on Muḥammad here and in verso 13–14 in contrast to the mercy called down on 'Alī in recto 3. 'Alī's talent for exposition (line 4) is not here meant to be limited to the allegorical interpretation of the Qur'ān. It may include the explanation of other texts and also the interpretation of dreams. For *عَلَّمَ = مَعْلَم* see Lane, art. *علم* under both subheadings.

Verso 4–5. Glorification by comparing one's self as leader to Muḥammad was a familiar device among the latter's Companions and their supporters, but more so among the 'Alids by virtue of their double blood tie to Muḥammad through Abū Ṭālib and Fāṭimah; cf. Ibn Sa'd IV 1, p. 24; Tirmidhī XIII 190, where Muḥammad himself is reported to have said that 'Alī's brother Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib (cf. verso 10) resembled him, Muḥammad, in both looks and character.

Verso 5–8. It is possible in line 5 to read *فشر لنا*, “advise us.” The reference is to the controversial role of 'Alī at the time of the revolt against the Caliph 'Uthmān and the subsequent siege that ended with 'Uthmān's murder. The broken papyrus text is no doubt presenting 'Alī in the role of would-be peacemaker, against the claims of 'Alī's detractors, who see him as an instigator of the revolt (cf. e.g. Ṭabarī I 2777–99 and see the present author's *Aishah*, pp. 126 f. and references there cited). For a Shī'ite view of these events see *Nahj al-balāghah* I 71 f., II 84–86; 'Āmilī III 2, pp. 119–30.

Verso 8–9. The story here is that several leading Companions, including even Abū Bakr, had previously attempted expeditions, all of which ended in failure. It was then that Muḥammad was inspired to give the banner to 'Alī, the best of the Companions, and so to assure success and victory. Muḥammad therefore made 'Alī his standard-bearer on the next expedition, which was against the Jews of Khaibar. The rest is history. 'Alī functioned as standard-bearer on other occasions (see *Sirah*,

pp. 761 f.; Bukhārī II 434; Muslim XV 176 f.; Abū Nu'aim I 62 f.). Tradition reports Muḥammad as saying that 'Alī would be his standard-bearer on the Day of Resurrection (see Abū Nu'aim I 65 f.).

Note the word used here for flag or banner, الطائر instead of the more familiar علم, لواء, or راية. Of the latter, the first two are used interchangeably for the personal insignia or flag of individual commanders; the last is a larger banner or standard associated with a larger unit of an army. The distinction between the two, according to Ibn Ishāq, seems to have come in at the very Battle of Khaibar, where 'Alī won his victory. What 'Alī received from Muḥammad was the latter's white personal flag. The *rāyah* or standard of Muḥammad was made at that time of a black cloak that had belonged to 'Āishah (cf. Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 77, 92 f., II 2, p. 127; see also Ibn Sa'd I 2, pp. 41 f.; Bukhārī II 242; Nawawī, p. 660). Muḥammad was generally partial to white for his clothes and personal effects. To this day his followers, especially the men, show a marked preference for white.

For a Shi'ite view of the early use, color, and history of flags and for 'Alī as Muḥammad's standard-bearer, see 'Āmili II, pp. 151, 257-64, III 1, pp. 69-71, 177, 329-31. For the flags and insignias of many colors used in the Battle of Ṣiffīn, see 'Āmili III 2, p. 322.

Verso 9-12. These lines indicate that the author of the text belonged to the Zaidite sect, which advocated equality among the descendants of Abū Ṭālib as against any claim to superiority by 'Alī or any of his descendants. The terms "Alawī" and "Alawīyah" refer to the followers of 'Alī himself, while the terms "Ṭālibī" and "Ṭālibīyah" indicate the more inclusive group. It should be noted that the heresiologists of the fourth century and later seem to use "Ṭālibīyīn" in preference to the "Ṭālibīyah" of this earlier papyrus text. Early Shi'ite writers place all the sons of Abū Ṭālib on an equality with Muḥammad himself by endowing their common grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, with divine light, which was transmitted in turn to his descendants: النور في عبد المطلب ثم ابي طالب ثم محمد ثم علي; cf. Naubakhtī (fl. 317/929), *Fīraq al-Shī'ah*, ed. H. Ritter (Istanbul, 1931) pp. 40 f.; Ibn Bābūyah (d. 381/991), *Risālat al-i'tiqād*, trans. Asaf A. A. Fyzee ("Islamic Research Association Series," No. 9 [London and New York, 1942]) pp. 112-14. Note the effort in the last reference (p. 114) to have Muḥammad place the girls on an equal footing with the boys: "Our daughters are like our sons, and our sons, like our daughters."

The early sources do not refer to 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu'āwīyah by his *kunya*, which was, according to line 10, Abū Ja'far. His full name and descent should read 'Abū Ja'far 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu'āwīyah ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib. More than one story is told in connection with the strange appearance of the name Mu'āwīyah (for the Umayyad Mu'āwīyah ibn Abī Sufyān) in this genealogy. 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far won favor with the Umayyad caliph by naming his son Mu'āwīyah. The 'Abd Allāh of the text, known also as Ibn Mu'āwīyah, was unhappily embarrassed by this incident and name, which, according to some accounts, led to his betrayal and eventual murder (cf. *Aghānī* XI 71, 73 f.; Ibn al-Athīr V 284 f.).

The revolt, defeat, and death of Zaid ibn 'Alī in 122/740 and of 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu'āwīyah in 129/746-47 are familiar topics in Islāmic history. For the first see Ya'qūbī II 390 f.; Ṭabarī II 1667-88, 1698-1716; Ibn al-Athīr V 171-77, 181-86; Mas'ūdī V 467-73; Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *Maqātil al-Ṭālibīyīn* (Cairo, 1949) pp. 127-51. For the second see Ṭabarī II 1879-87, 1976-80; Ibn al-Athīr V 246-48, 282-85; Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *op. cit.* pp. 161-69; *Aghānī* XI 71-79. The religious role of both men as founders of Shi'ite sects is familiar to Islāmic heresiologists. For the Zaidīyah see Ash'arī (d. 243/935), *Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn*, ed. Ritter ("Bibliotheca Islamica" I a-c [Constantinople, 1929-33]) I 61-78; cf. Malāṭī (d. 377/987), *Kitāb al-tanbih*, pp. 26-28; Naubakhtī, *Fīraq al-Shī'ah*, pp. 19, 29-32; Ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), *Kitāb al-farq bain al-fīraq . . .* (Cairo, 1328) pp. 16 f., 22-26; Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), *Kitāb al-fāṣil fi al-mīlāl wa-al-ahwā' wa-al-niḥāl* (Cairo, 1317-21) V 87-111, 179 f.; Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153), *Kitāb al-mīlāl wa-al-niḥāl*, on the margins of Ibn Ḥazm (Vol. 1 207-14). For a study of the founder and his movement, see Rudolf Strothmann in *EI* IV 1193 f.,

1176–98, and in *Der Islam* XIII (1923) 1–52. For the intellectual gifts and literary activity of Zaid ibn ‘Alī, see below, p. 107, n. 2.

The particular sect of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mu‘āwiyah is an offshoot of the Zaidīyah. It is generally known as the “Jināḥīyah,” taking this name from ‘Abd Allāh’s grandfather Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib, who was known as “Dhū al-Jināḥain,” “He of the Two Wings,” and also as “al-Ṭaiyār,” “the Flyer,” whereby hangs a queer tale passed on by Ibn Ishāq and others. The gist of the story is that Ja‘far, who was Muḥammad’s standard-bearer in the expedition against the Byzantines at Mūtah, received many fatal wounds, including the loss of both hands. God rewarded him by replacing the hands with wings which, Muḥammad explained, Ja‘far uses to fly about in heaven (cf. *Sirah*, pp. 209, 218, 344, 791, 794 f.; Ibn Sa‘d II 1, pp. 92 f., IV 1, pp. 26 f.; Ṭabarī I 1610–16; Bukhārī II 436; Abū Nu‘aim I 114–18; *Iṣābah* I 485–88). For the sect as such, see Ash‘arī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyin* I 85 f.; Ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-farq*, pp. 242, 255; Ibn Ḥazm, *Kitāb al-fāṣil* IV 180; Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-milal*, I 196; see also Friedländer, “The heterodoxies of the Shiites in the presentation of Ibn Ḥazm,” *JASOS* XXVIII (1907) 44 f. For a modern Shi‘ite treatment of both these sects, see ‘Amilī II 344, 351 f., 353.

The reputation for goodness and generosity was freely extended to the members of the family of Abū Ṭālib and particularly to his son Ja‘far, who came to be known as “Abū al-Masākīn,” because of his concern for the poor, and as “al-Jawwād,” because of his cheerful generosity to all. These qualities and the resulting reputation passed on to the third and fourth generations, giving rise to the sentiment expressed in the papyrus text, which finds the variant “al-Jawwād ibn al-Jawwād” in Nawawī, pp. 192, 337 (cf. also Bukhārī II 436; Tirmidhī XIII 189–91). Abū Nu‘aim I 114 characterizes Ja‘far as *مضيف المساكين . . . البطل الشجاع الجواد الشعاع*.

Verso 13–14. The use of the future tense here establishes the papyrus as a preface or introduction to some Shi‘ite monograph. Brief monographs were the rule in early Islāmic literature, alike with the orthodox and the nonorthodox. Later, the Shi‘ah specifically frowned on brevity—perhaps in an effort to catch up with the voluminous Sunnite literature—and full accounts won greater favor (cf. Ibn Bābūyah, *Risālat al-i‘tiqād*, p. 116). For the book title mentioned in line 14, see the discussion below on authorship and date.

Verso 14–17. These lines reflect the practical utilitarianism as well as the religious objectives of Islāmic historiography.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

The script of the papyrus places it as definitely in the third century of the Hijrah as the text assigns it to Shi‘ite biography, history, and/or propaganda. It should be noted that the script can lay no claim to artistry of any sort, that the margins are unusually narrow, and that the verso is written upside down in relation to the recto. These features, together with the contents of the piece, indicate a *musawwadah* or rough draft or copy of some author’s work. It is entirely possible that the beginning and the end of the preface were written on the recto and the verso respectively of the section of the papyrus which is broken off at the top. Unfortunately, the text, being largely in the nature of a table of contents, is not promising material for significant textual parallels. The few *isnād*’s quoted in the text are too meager and indefinite to enable one to suggest a possible author and his sources. However, that the author was a Zaidite is inferred from his emphasis on the Ṭālibīyīn and from the fact that in addition to Muḥammad and ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib he mentions as specific biographees only Zaid ibn ‘Alī, from whom the Zaidites take their name, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mu‘āwiyah, whose followers formed a subgroup within the Zaidite sect.

The failure of the revolts of Zaid ibn ‘Alī and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mu‘āwiyah (verso 9–10) was followed by the establishment and consolidation of the ‘Abbāsids when ‘Irāq became too uncomfortable for the ‘Alids. Nevertheless Shi‘ite propaganda became intensified with each decade and spread far and wide

in the other provinces of the empire.¹ This naturally meant increased Shī'ite literary activity.² The growth of Shī'ite literature received added incentive as a result of the rise of the Ismā'īliyah movement about the middle of the second century and its progressive growth thereafter until in 297/909 it succeeded in establishing the Fāṭimids in North Africa where the Shī'ite Idrīsids had become established more than a century earlier in 172/788. Egyptian Shī'ites contributed openly and secretly to the progress of these movements, Egypt being a sort of halfway house for fugitive 'Alids and would-be dynasts in North Africa. 'Alid biography, history, and propaganda, political and religious, were increasingly called into service. The period produced the well known Shī'ite historian Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim of Kūfah (d. 212/827).³ Papyrus *PERF* No. 775, dealing with 'Alid revolutions, is the only known extant 'Alid document dating from the first half of the second century of Islām.⁴ However, Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, writing in 313/925, regrets the lack of information on the later 'Alids and their activities in contrast to the wealth of materials available in and from the earlier period.⁵ This was perhaps due in part to the widespread disturbances during the reign of Muqtadir. It is nevertheless to this period that the present papyrus belongs.

The starting point in the search for an author is the reference to Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (recto 5 and 10), on whom the author of the piece draws freely for his materials on 'Alī. The biobibliographical materials available, Sunnite or Shī'ite, list no traditionist or author generally and specifically known as Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, though they do mention many an 'Abd al-Wahhāb. The most important of these is the Baṣran traditionist 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Majīd al-Thaqafī (108–94/726–809).⁶ Again, the sources name quite a few traditionists whose fathers bore the name 'Abd al-Wahhāb, including Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, the oldest son of the above-mentioned traditionist (see references cited in n. 6). Others of interest at this point are 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (a younger contemporary of Hammād ibn Zaid, who died in 179/795), who is quoted by Bukhārī in connection with the family of Muḥammad.⁷ There is also an Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, who is quoted by Abū Nu'aim in connection with 'Alī and his descendants.⁸ The activities of most of these fall in the second half of the second century, with the possibility that those of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (no death date available) may have continued into the early third century, since his father died as late as 194/809.

We can go no further in the matter of identification so far as the predominantly Sunnite sources are concerned. It is the Shī'ite Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī who provides the best clue as to the most probable author of the papyrus and his earlier sources. Among the *isnād*'s for materials on the early 'Alids in Abū al-Faraj's *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyin* are the following: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'id al-Hamdānī informed me on the direct authority of Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan on the direct authority of Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb on the direct authority (1) of 'Isā ibn 'Abd Allāh and (2) of (Ismā'il) ibn Abī Uwais.⁹ This Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, a link in thoroughly Shī'ite *isnād*'s, is obviously the Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb

¹ Cf. Ya'qūbī II 395 f.; Ibn al-Athīr V 284; Goldziher in *ZDMG* I 111–13; Sultan, *Étude sur Nahj al-balāgha*, pp. 11 f., 133.

² Early Shī'ite literary activity, like that of the Sunnites, revolved around Tradition and jurisprudence. One of the earliest productive leaders in these fields was Zaid ibn 'Alī of the present document, whose *Majmū' al-fiqh* or *Corpus Juris* has come down to us in a 4th-/10th-century recension. For the controversy on this Zaid ibn 'Alī and his works see *GAL* S I 313 f. and references there cited, esp. those to Strothmann and Griffini.

³ Cf. *GAL* S I 213 f.

⁴ For other revolutionary, but not necessarily 'Alid, documents from Egypt see *PERF* Nos. 788 and 789, both dating from 253/867.

⁵ *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyin* (Cairo, 1949) pp. 4 f., 721.

⁶ Cf. *Ma'ārif*, p. 257; Ṭabarī I 89; *Aghānī* XVII 13,

18–20, 23. Ṭabarī's Index lists 7, and that of *Aghānī* lists 5.

⁷ Bukhārī II 437; Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 57. There is also a second traditionist named Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, who is, however, better known as Abū Aḥmad al-Farrā' al-'Abdī al-Nisābūrī (d. 272/885 or 886, aged 95 years) and who does not seem to be particularly associated with 'Alid history (see Dhahabī II 158 f.).

⁸ E.g. Abū Nu'aim III 136, 143, 174. More than one Aḥmad seems to be involved in these references, including an Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, a fact which suggests the possibility of a family *isnād* tracing back to the above-mentioned 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Majīd al-Thaqafī.

⁹ *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyin* (Cairo, 1949), pp. 10 and 85 respectively; see also p. 114, where it is possible that Ismā'il ibn Abī Idrīs is a scribal or printer's error for Ismā'il ibn Abī Uwais.

of the papyrus text. Nevertheless he seems to be the one link in these *isnād*'s that is consistently ignored by the biographers (see p. 103). His dates therefore must be inferred from those of his contemporaries who transmitted traditions either to or from him. Of the former, 'Īsā ibn 'Abd Allāh is a well known 'Alid, who is credited with an unnamed book but for whom no death date seems available.¹ But the still better known contemporary author and fellow transmitter to Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Ismā'il ibn Abī Uwais, died in 226/840–41,² a fact which definitely places Bakr in the early third century. This dating is confirmed by Abū al-Faraj and Nadīm each in a single and incidental reference to Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb as a link in an *isnād* where he transmits traditions on the direct authority of Wāqidi (d. 207/822).³

Again, the Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan and the Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd of Abū al-Faraj's *isnād*'s quoted above are the only traditionists and authors who are in any way linked with Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb so far as the available sources are concerned. Yaḥyā was an 'Alid and is credited with two books, one on the Mosque of the Prophet and the other on 'Alid genealogies.⁴ Whether or not the Yaḥyā of recto 17 of our papyrus (see p. 104) is the Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan under discussion is hard to say, though such a possibility must be considered because of the fact that the *isnād* of recto 17 is *mu'an'an*, that is, one in which some links may be missing.

Abū al-Faraj's immediate source, the Kūfan Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd al-Hamdānī, known also as Ibn 'Uqdah (249–332/863–943), was the most famous Zaidite traditionist and author of his day.⁵ The long list of books credited to him includes such titles as *The Book of Those Who Transmitted Traditions on the Authority of 'Alī*, *The Book of Those Who Transmitted Traditions on the Authority of Zaid ibn 'Alī*, and *The Book of the Remembrance of the Prophet (Kitāb dhikr al-Nabī)*. The last is in all probability the work mentioned in verso 14 of the papyrus as *Dhikr al-Rasūl*. The list includes several other monographs devoted to individual 'Alids and other descendants of Abū Ṭālib but no works devoted to them collectively.⁶ This again is in agreement with the papyrus text, which indicates that a brief collective treatment of the family of the Prophet was appended to the author's *Book of the Remembrance of the Prophet* (or *Messenger*). All in all, therefore, there can be little doubt that the present papyrus text stems from this last work and is some Egyptian's rough copy of the same. For though its Kūfan author was never in Egypt, he and his works were widely known and some of his materials were carried by scholars to Egypt.⁷

¹ Ṭūsī, p. 249, No. 546; *Mizān* II 312 f., No. 2491.

² Ṭūsī, p. 368, No. 805; Dhahabī I 369 f.; *Mizān* I 103 f., No. 834.

³ *Maqātil al-Ṭālibīyīn* (Cairo, 1949) p. 280; *Fihrist*, p. 25.

⁴ Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil al-Ṭālibīyīn* (Cairo, 1949) p. 7; Ṭūsī, p. 360, No. 782. No dates are given.

⁵ *Maqātil al-Ṭālibīyīn* (Cairo, 1949) p. 7 and *passim* throughout the work; Khaṭīb V 14–23; Dhahabī III 55–57; *Mizān* I 64 f.; Ṭūsī, pp. 42–44. *GAL* and *GAL* S have no entry on him. Goldziher, *Studien* II 230, n. 5, has mistaken the date of Ibn 'Uqdah's birth for that of his death.

⁶ Ṭūsī, p. 43.

⁷ Khaṭīb V 21.

ACCOUNT OF A BATTLE IN THE REIGN OF MUQTADIR PROBABLY FROM THE *ṢILAH* OF FARAGHĀNĪ

Oriental Institute No. 17640. First half of fourth/tenth century.

Fine medium brown papyrus, 19 × 18.5 cm., broken at right and bottom. There is no way of estimating the full size of the page or the number of lines to the page, though it is not likely that the page was more than a fourth larger than the fragment, with some 20 or 21 lines to the page. The narrow margin at the top is intact, but the outer margin is broken, with some of it cut away. The papyrus, particularly the verso, is much damaged by peeling and by numerous breaks, large and small.

Script.—Medium-sized carefully written book hand (see p. 4). The letters *ṣād* and *kāf* are generally angular. Diacritical points are remarkably rare for a fourth-century document. They are used in only three instances—for the *bā'* of *sab'ūn* in verso 7 and for the *fā'* of *fī* in recto 11 and 14, where they are least needed. The poetry of the piece, on the other hand, is entirely without some needed dots and vowels. The small circle with the dot inside is used for interverse and verse punctuation.

TEXT

RECTO

- | | |
|---|----|
| ○ اقدم وانشاء يقول ○ [يا] يلبق انى اشتهمى لقاكا ○ يا قاتل الفرسان من شقاكا ○ | 1 |
| ○ فاقدم [ابن العجوز وهو هلال وانشاء يقول ○ | 2 |
| ○ بالركن وبالا[ح]نجابى انجاباً صادقاً انى اتملى لاطعن يلبق بالنشايى ○ | 3 |
| ○ انى انا الفارس ذو السلاحى وقاتل الفرسان بالرباحى ○ واصبر | 4 |
| ○ [ما]صبح الصباحى ○ فلما سمع يلبق ذلك هاله ثم ذكر بيت قاله | 5 |
| ○ [الكشف طول الليل حتى كانت فيها ام سمعان ○ ثم خرج من زاوية البيت | 6 |
| ○ [وا]فانى اخف لحرب امر شاردى ○ سامكن مولاي واحمى | 7 |
| ○ عصيان ما انت فاعلى ○ تاقى اذا الهيجاء فلست | 8 |
| ○ [مت]وكل ○ فقال لاص[حا]به خلوا عنى حتى انظر | 9 |
| ○ [فى] الامر ثم قال لا[صحابه] لا خوف عليكم ثم التفت الى بعضهم فقال [ت]رد اليه | 10 |
| ○ [وترده عن القتال] فجاء يتعقب به فذهب فى ر[ده] فقال اثبت فلا تنفجر فى | 11 |
| ○ [قتل المسلمين فيك]ان معف[لياً] عليك [ال]عصيان هذا فقال فلان و[قد] كان طغم | 12 |
| ○ [صاحبك يخاف] الحرب تبعت عصيان ابى [و]نادى صاحب | 13 |
| ○ [الفرسان] العد[وان] العادى وقاد من الفرسان فى | 14 |
| ○ [الميمنة فلان وفى المبصرة فلان و]ذلك الفرسان | 15 |
| ○ [اجمعهم] | 16 |

DOCUMENT 8

VERSO

- 1 وقال لهم ان قتل يحيى كان عار علينا ثم اخر الذمير رامية اله[جاء عنهم]
 2 فسار كل واحد يهيا اصحابه بالطبول والاعلا[م] والالوية الى
 3 مجتمعهم عشر الاف وستون فمسكروا خارج المدينة[ة] ادعى الجاسوس
 4 وساله عن حاله فاخبره خبره ثم خبره خبر العصيان وذ[كر الع]س[كر و]
 5 حاله فلما بلغ العصيان قدوم العدوان [و] جمع العدو اسر[عوا اليهم]
 6 ثم ان الغيران سار الى العصيان القابلة فالتقيا بغارة ال[رما]ح
 7 مئة الف فاره ومن المسلمين خم[سة] وسبعون وذ[هب] العصيان
 8 [و] ذهبت انصارهم ثم ان طويق صاحب الذمير قال لاصحابه
 9 فاني قد نمت المدينة[ة] بالليل من الوجد وكان []
 10 وكان شاعراً قوالاً صادقاً وكان يص[ادق] فلان []
 11 وكان اقسم اليه رد تايدته فجاء به يلبقا وثنا عليه فنفره ه[لال] فقال
 12 لولا الحسان للجند [لكان صابك] كما صابه في القتال []
 13 اذا ما تكتب انت العقد الينا وان كتبت فاك تخر[ج] فابي طويق
 14 وعص[ف] فقال ه[لال] ان لم تخبرني اهدمه ك[ما] ه[دمت] غيره فقال طويق
 15 تعف عني بعد نهار اذا كتبت الى بذلك اخ[برت]ك عن اصحاب
 16 السيوف من اهل []
 17 الطوا[ئف] []

TRANSLATION

It would be futile to attempt a line-by-line translation of the fragmentary poetry of recto 1-9. Fortunately the piece can be placed in its proper historical setting. It is therefore possible to give a fairly complete though perforce largely conjectural reconstruction and translation of the greater part of the lost text of the remaining lines.

RECTO

- 1-5 Hilāl ibn al-'Ajūz and a second man (name lost) in the rebel camp taunt Yalbuq (commander of the caliph's forces) with verses expressing their eagerness to meet and fell him with their piercing arrows and extol their own heroic qualities as cavalry lancers.
 5-9 On hearing this, Yalbuq is greatly disturbed but responds in turn with several verses. The first couplet (in *qaṣīdah* style) recalls the house of the beloved, while the remaining verses impute cowardly flight to the enemy, defy him in action, and confidently predict and anticipate victory in battle with the help of God.
 9 He (Yalbuq) said to his companions, "Leave me alone so that I can give thought
 10 [to the matter]." Later he said to his] companions, "You are in no (immediate) danger (of battle)." Then he turned to one of them and said, "You shall return to him (the enemy)
 11 [and turn him away from giving battle.]" So he (the courier) followed close on his (the rebel's) heels and proceeded to dis[suade him, saying,] "Stand firm and do not commit the immoral act of

ACCOUNT OF A BATTLE IN THE REIGN OF MUQTADIR

III

- 12 [fighting against the Muslims, and] your present disobe[dience will be for]given you." [But he
(the rebel) said—a]nd he was a fool—
13 ["Your master fears] the war! (As for me) I follow my father in his rebellion." And he summoned
the master
14 [of the horse . . . And] the courier [returned from the en]emy (camp). The commander of the
cavalry on
15 [the right wing was So-and-So, and he of the cavalry on the left wing was So-and-So. And] the
cavalry [was . . .
16 . . .] all of them.
17 (Some 4 or 5 lines of text are lost.)

VERSO

- 1 And he (Yalbuq or one of his men) said to them, "It would indeed be a disgrace for us should
Yahyā fall." He then held back the hurler of satire at them (the enemy).
2 Then each (of the caliphal army commanders) equipped his men with drums, flags, and banners,
and they marched to the place of
3 their encampment, (each unit) 10,060 strong. They encamped outside the city. Then [he (Yalbuq)
called the (chief) army scout and]
4 asked him about his situation. And he (the scout) gave (first) his report (of their own army) and
then he gave him news of the rebels, describ[ing their a]rm[y and]
5 its condition. When news of the enemy's approach and of their numbers reached the rebels, they
ha[stened] toward [them].
6 Then the chargers (of the caliphal army) rushed against the advancing enemy, and the two (forces)
clashed in a charge of the [lance]rs.
7 There were (of the enemy) 100,000 fighters and of the Muslims 75(000). And [the rebels fl]ed
8 [and] their allies fled (too). Then Ṭuwaitq, the commander of the rebel inciters (to battle) said to
his men, "Go (your way; as for me,)
9 I hope to make my way to the city under cover of night. And he [. . . (was either captured or gave
himself up)].
10 And he was a poet, eloquent and sincere. And he used to be friendly with [. . . (Mu'nis or/and
Yalbuq? See pp. 113-14 below)].
11 And he (Mu'nis or Yalbuq?) was under oath to return a favor he owed him (Ṭuwaitq). Then he
(Ṭuwaitq) was brought before Yalbuq, and he greeted him. Now Hilāl (a fellow officer of
Yalbuq's) repelled him, saying,
12 "Had it not been out of (our) consideration for the troops you (too) would certainly have suffered
as calamitous an experience as he (the rebel of recto 11-13 or his father) did in th[e battle . . .
(You will certainly be imprisoned or put to death)]
13 if you do not give us a written agreement (of co-operation). But if you do give us a written agree-
ment [you will] go [free. But Ṭuwaitq refused]
14 and remained firm (in his refusal). Then H[ilāl] said, "If you will not give me the information
(sought) I will demolish it (the enemy's fort or arsenal?) anyway, as I have demolished oth[ers]."
Then Ṭuwaitq said,]
15 "Excuse me (for the present. However,) should you, after a day, give me a written guarantee of
that (promised freedom), then I sh[all inform you of the source of supply]
16 of the swords from the people [of . . . (and of the source of supply of such-and-such arms from)]
17 the (other) groups of peo[ple . . .].

Comments.—*Recto* 1-9. بلى could also be read بلىق, and it is indeed so found in some of the sources. Unfortunately, our papyrus, being unpointed, throws no light on these variants.

It is not unusual in Muslim warfare for a war of words to precede the actual clash of arms. The verses so employed are sometimes extempore and sometimes quotations from a rich lore of war poetry. Hilāl ibn al-'Ajūz remains unidentified as either poet or soldier. The only clue that has turned up which may point to his family connections is found in Khaṭīb IV 401, which lists a contemporary Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī al-'Ajūz (d. 311/923). Hilāl's companion, unnamed here, might well be the poet, "eloquent and sincere," of verso 10. Both men are, as is Yalbuq himself, primarily soldiers, despite the poetic ability of all three of them as expressed in these obviously extempore verses, with the exception perhaps of Yalbuq's first couplet (recto 5 f.). The record of this verbal war was undoubtedly part of an original eyewitness account of the battle made by the local or party campaign historians (see p. 115).

Recto 11-12. Unpointed poetry frequently leads to the misreading of the original text. These incomplete verses are particularly vulnerable. The readings here given seem to be the most likely considering both the rhyme and the spirit of the verses. Alternative readings for the word read as اثبت in the sense "stand firm (and hold back from evil-doing)" could be اتيت, "you have come (thus far in rebellion)," or even ابيت, "you have disdained." The space available for the missing name in line 12 would accommodate no more than three or four letters. The bearer of this name is obviously the son of the chief leader of the rebels.

Verso 1. An alternative reading for the word read as قتل, "death," is قبل, "to approach" or "advance." If it is Yahyā's "death" that would be a disgrace, then he would have to be a man of considerable importance in Yalbuq's camp. On the other hand, if it is his "advance," either in command of an enemy unit or in personal challenge, then the statement would imply an insult offered by the enemy and Yahyā would have to be a man of no great consequence in the enemy camp. Such refined insults were sometimes offered the enemy in pre-battle personal combat, *mubārazah*. Instances are known where an enemy refused to accept a challenge on the grounds that the challenger was not his equal in rank or dignity. The reading "death" is preferred here because there is strong reason to believe that the Yahyā involved is none other than Yahyā ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭabarī, Yalbuq's powerful secretary and full partner in his intrigues (see p. 114). The speaker in this line, therefore, is probably either Yalbuq or some high official in his camp.

Verso 2. For the effective use of small drums and the spectacular display of flags and banners during a march, see Alfred von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen* I (Wien, 1875) 224, 228 (= Salahuddin Khuda Bukhsh, *The Orient under the Caliphs* [Calcutta, 1920] pp. 329, 334).

Verso 3. The identification of the city and the site of the battle depend on the date of the major campaign in which the engagement took place, which will be discussed below. The odd figure 10,060 reflects the organization of the army corps of the time, though this organization is not specifically so designated in the sources at hand for this particular period, that is, the early fourth century. The army organization would seem to have been basically that of the time of Mustā'in (248-51/862-66; see Ibn Khaldūn, *Ta'rikh* [Cairo, 1867] III 299), which in its turn differed in but one point from that of the time of Ma'mūn (193-98/809-13; see Mas'ūdī VI 452 f.). The latter had units of 10, 100, 1000, and 10,000, the last figure constituting an army corps commanded by an *amīr* or full-fledged general. In Ibn Khaldūn's account the three lower units are 10, 50, and 100. It will be noticed that the figure 10,060 of the papyrus can best be explained if one assumes the presence of two extra units of 10 and 50—perhaps representing the noncombatant personnel mentioned by both Ibn Khaldūn and Mas'ūdī—attached to a regular army corps of 10,000. An exhaustive study of Arab army organization still remains to be written. For a brief reference to the theme under the 'Abbāsids see Hitti, *History of the Arabs* (5th ed.) pp. 326-29. Mas'ūdī is credited with a work entitled *Naẓm al-jawāhir fī tadbīr al-mamālik wa-al-'asākīr* (see *Tanbih*, p. vi), which no doubt contained information on army organization in early Islām. His interest in the subject is reflected in *Tanbih*, pp. 279-81, where he names and describes the various army units. For a fourteenth-century Arab treatment of the various phases of horsemanship and warfare, see Ibn Hudhail, *Tuhfat al-anfus* (*L'Ornement des âmes*) ed. and trans. Louis Mercier

(Paris, 1936 and 1939). For a rich bibliography on these themes see Ibn Hudhail, *Ḥilyat al-fursān* (*La parure des cavaliers*) ed. and trans. Mercier, II (Paris, 1924) 423–59.

Verso 7. Note the use of فَرَّه, “brisk,” “agile,” “strong,” to cover the personnel and the mounts of the army; cf. Lane, art. فَرَّه, for the application of the term to *ghulmān*, “young men” or “young slaves.” These, it should be noted, constituted the backbone of the army units. The term is equally applicable to such mounts as hackneys, mules, and asses; but there seems to be a long-standing controversy as to its applicability to Arabian horses.

The use of the word *muslimin* to indicate the caliphal army points, in the present setting, to the heretical Qaramatians as the opposing force, though any rebel, regardless of his sect affiliation, could be considered to have forfeited his status as a true Muslim.

The discrepancy in size between the rebel and the caliphal army, 100,000 and 75,000 respectively, is not unusual in the reign of Muqtadir, when large Qaramatian armies and other rebel groups overran the empire. In the present instance there were “allies” to swell the numbers in the rebel camp. For other battle statistics of the reign see e.g. *Eclipse* I 233; Ibn al-Athīr VIII 117; Ibn Taghribirdī II 229 f.

Verso 8. Ṭuwaīq, who is described as a poet in line 10, may be the unnamed poet of recto 1.

Verso 9. The Arabs, as a rule, avoided night fighting.

Verso 10. For poetically inclined warriors see Comments on recto 1–9.

Verso 11. Hilāl’s tendency to arrogance is borne out by some of the sources; see e.g. Kindī, *Kitāb al-wulāh wa-kitāb al-quḍāh*, ed. Rhuvon Guest (“‘E. J. W. Gibb Memorial’ Series” XIX [Leyden and London, 1912]) pp. 528, 537.

Verso 17. This one word could also be reconstructed as الطوا[فون], “watchmen,” or as الطوا[ئق], “vaults” (for storing arms?), or as الطوا[غى], “rebels.”

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The historical setting of the papyrus text is the turbulent reign of Muqtadir (295–320/908–32) with its vicious court intrigues, Turkish military control, large-scale Qaramatian wars, and vassal dynastic rebellions in one or more of the provinces of the still vast ‘Abbāsīd Empire. Of the many generals who fought the caliph’s battles none was more able or ambitious than Mu’nis al-Khādim, who used his military power to support his moves in the dangerous game of kingmaker and who was generally as successful in his intrigues as he was in his campaigns.¹ It was he who foiled the first attempts of the Fāṭimids to conquer Egypt and he who, despite initial defeat and capture, eventually subdued Ibn Abī al-Sāj, the rebel governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan, and brought him as a prisoner to Baghdād (307/919–20). He matched military wits and strength with the dread leader of the Qaramatians, Abū Ṭāhir al-Jannābī, at whose hands he suffered one of his rare defeats (315/927–28). Finally, he tamed the Ḥamdānids of Maṣīl to do his bidding in his last rebellion against Muqtadir, which ended in that caliph’s death in the aftermath of battle (320/932). Shortly thereafter, he and his chief supporters overreached themselves in the role of kingmaker. A plot to depose or dispose of Qāhir, whom they had helped to raise to the throne, boomeranged and ended in their own cold-blooded murder. Among the heads that fell were those of ‘Alī and his father, Yalbuq, and finally that of Mu’nis himself.²

Though Mu’nis is not mentioned in the papyrus text (his name may have appeared in the lost sections, perhaps in verso 10), the mention of his chamberlain Yalbuq and his retainer Hilāl, together with the large number of troops involved, even with allowance for some exaggeration, leaves little room to doubt that the fragment on hand is from a record of one of Mu’nis’ major campaigns. While at

¹ For a full account of the disastrous reign and of the chief personalities involved at court and on the battlefield, see Harold Bowen, *The Life and Times of ‘Alī ibn ‘Isā, ‘the Good Vizier’* (Cambridge, 1928).

² See under the years mentioned above in Ṭabarī; ‘Arib ibn Sa’d, *Ṣīlat ta’rīkh al-Ṭabarī*, ed. M. J. de

Goeje (Lugduni Batavorum, 1897); *Eclipse*; Ibn al-Athīr. For brief accounts of the reign of Muqtadir see Mas’ūdī VIII 247–86; *Tanbīh*, pp. 376–89; Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī, *Ta’rīkh sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa-al-anbiyā’* (*Annalium*) ed. J. M. E. Gottwaldt, I (Lipsiae, 1844) 201–16.

military headquarters, Mu'nis sometimes dispatched Yalbuq with a detachment of men on some preliminary engagement. But while on the march or in battle formation, it was Mu'nis himself who led the center, while Yalbuq commanded the right wing, with his son 'Alī, among others, in subordinate command. It was in such a formation that father and son helped Mu'nis in the final defeat of Muqtadir.¹ Hilāl, too, was quite prominent in both the military and the political events of the reign. He was sent against Ibn Abī al-Sāj, who defeated him and took him captive to his provincial capital of Ardabīl. Later he was appointed governor of Egypt (309–11/921–23). Still later he was an active participant in Mu'nis' intrigues of 320–21.² Finally, Yaḥyā, the secretary of Yalbuq, was no ordinary clerk. He was in Yalbuq's confidence and at times felt secure or powerful enough to undertake some intrigues of his own.³

Without a clue in the papyrus itself as to either date or place, it is impossible to identify with certainty the specific battle involved. However, it is possible, by a process of elimination, to determine the major campaign in which the particular engagement was fought. Mu'nis' Egyptian campaigns are excluded, since neither Yalbuq nor Hilāl is associated with them. The battle of 315 against the Qaramatians ended in defeat for Mu'nis, while the papyrus text definitely points to a victory. Still to consider are the two remaining major wars of Mu'nis—that of 304–7 against Ibn Abī al-Sāj and that of 319–20 against the caliph himself. Clues within and without the papyrus point to the former as the campaign of the present text. For it is not likely that Yalbuq would have been bargaining with a captive visitor had Mu'nis' army been defeated. Hilāl's youthful haughtiness and aggressiveness could reflect his resentment at his recent captivity (305/917–18) at the hands of Ibn Abī al-Sāj, who had nevertheless given the captive Mu'nis an opportunity to escape. Mu'nis fully appreciated the favor, which he later returned in full measure. Whether or not Yalbuq was involved in this episode is hard to say. Nevertheless, as Mu'nis' chamberlain he must have known all there was to know in connection with the incident. It is highly probable that Ṭuwaitiq, the fugitive from the rebel camp, was someone who not only knew of the incident but had had a hand in it, with the connivance, of course, of Ibn Abī al-Sāj. If he had aided in Mu'nis' escape he would confidently expect some favor in return at the hands of Mu'nis and/or Yalbuq. This would seem to be the situation actually involved in verso 10–11, where the lost name in line 10 could well be that of Yalbuq or perhaps even that of Mu'nis, both of whom were active in the campaign of 304–7. At any rate, Ṭuwaitiq's expectations proved too optimistic, for he found himself captive. Perhaps he had expected to be brought before Mu'nis but found himself instead before Yalbuq, who seemingly did not consider himself under any sworn obligation to Ṭuwaitiq. The latter therefore, despite his initial refusal to give out any information, decides in the end to co-operate with the victors in return for his freedom.

In the setting of this campaign, the unnamed city of recto 3 would have to be Ardabīl, the then flourishing capital of the province of Azerbaijan, on the outskirts of which more than one engagement was fought in this war of 304–7/916–20, which ended with the capture and imprisonment of Ibn Abī al-Sāj. It was then that Mu'nis returned the personal favor he owed Ibn Abī al-Sāj. He eased his captive's imprisonment at first and eventually brought about a reconciliation between this former rebel and the Caliph Muqtadir.⁴ After his release and restoration to office Ibn Abī al-Sāj marched with Mu'nis against the Qaramatian leader Abū Ṭāhir al-Jannābī, who defeated Mu'nis and captured and executed Ibn Abī al-Sāj in 315/927–28.⁵ The fate of Mu'nis and his subordinate generals has already been indicated.

¹ See 'Arib, *Ṣilat ta'rikh al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 177 f., also pp. 147, 158, 163, 171 for other instances of field command under Mu'nis; *Eclipse* I 178, 254; Mas'ūdī VIII 286; Ibn al-Athīr VIII 126 f., 178 f. See *Tanbih*, p. 383, for another instance of Yalbuq's action on the field of battle.

² See *Eclipse* I 47, 126; Kindī, *Kitāb al-wulāh*, pp. 278 f., 528, 532; Ibn al-Athīr VIII 73–76; Ibn Taghrībirdī II 211–17; Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-*

mawā'iz wa-al-i'tibār (Būlāq, 1270) I 329. From the Kindī references it appears that Hilāl was an arrogant and impetuous young man, as is also illustrated in verso 11–14 of our text.

³ See *Eclipse* I 218, 242, 256 f.

⁴ Cf. 'Arib, *Ṣilat ta'rikh al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 70–72, 77 f.; *Eclipse* I 47–50, 82 f.

⁵ Cf. 'Arib, *op. cit.* pp. 132 f.; *Eclipse* I 174 f.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

Fourth-century papyrus documents consisting of official and private letters dealing primarily with Egyptian affairs are well represented in any fair-sized collection of Arabic papyri.¹ Third-century papyrus books are represented by extant manuscripts.² But fourth-century literary papyri, historical or otherwise, dealing with either Egyptian or non-Egyptian affairs have been, to the writer's best knowledge, unknown.³ Though it is possible that our Document 7 dates from the early fourth century, the fragment under discussion is the first definitely identifiable representative of this group to come to light. This gives it added interest and spurs on inquiry into the possibilities of its authorship and date.

The first possibility to suggest itself is that the papyrus is from an eyewitness account of the campaigns of Mu'nis and his subordinate generals Yalbuq and Hilāl. We know of one such "historian," Aḥmad ibn Za'farān, whose father, Za'farān, was another powerful retainer in Mu'nis' camp.⁴ Such eyewitness accounts, be they "official" or not, could not fail to be of interest to the campaign leaders. It will be recalled that Hilāl was appointed governor of Egypt less than two years after the campaign of 304-7. What could be more natural than that he, while in Egypt, should have had an account of that campaign put in final shape for his use? Such an account at that time and place would naturally be on papyrus, which was still holding its own in Egypt despite the encroachment of paper into this home province of papyrus.

A second possibility of authorship points in the direction of Ibn 'Abdūs al-Jahshiyārī (d. 331/942), the author of the *Kitāb al-wuzarā' wa-al kuttāb* and himself a prominent secretary at the time. He is credited with the authorship of a voluminous history of "thousands of pages" of the reign of Muqtadir, some parts of which were already in the hands of his younger contemporary Mas'ūdī,⁵ who wrote in the years before and after Ibn 'Abdūs' death. This lengthy work, now believed lost, must have taken some years to compose, and the original was no doubt written on paper, which was by the early fourth century almost the exclusive writing material of 'Irāq. Our papyrus fragment, nevertheless, could well be from a copy or an abridgement of an extract of Ibn 'Abdūs' work made in Egypt, again perhaps for Hilāl, or for some other imperial official stationed in Egypt not much later than Hilāl's governorship.

But again, according to Mas'ūdī, Ibn 'Abdūs had several contemporaries who also compiled records of the reigns of Muqtadir and other caliphs. There is no reason why some of these could not have been at work at times in Egypt and at other times in 'Irāq. This was indeed the case with Mas'ūdī himself, who spent the last years of his life in Egypt (336-45/947-56) and who informs us that in addition to his brief account of Muqtadir's reign in his *Murūj* he had already written at length of the wars and battles of Muqtadir's reign, of the histories of Ibn Abī al-Sāj and Mu'nis and Sulaimān ibn al-Ḥasan al-Jannābī (= Abū Ṭāhir al-Jannābī, leader of the Qaramatians) in his *Akḥbār al-zamān* and at lesser length in his *Kitāb al-awsāṭ*.⁶ There is, therefore, a possibility that if the complete manuscripts of these works, particularly the *Akḥbār al-zamān*, are ever brought to light our fragment may yet prove to be from the pen of this famous and prolific author.⁷

There still remains another, perhaps the most likely, possibility of authorship. The many clues here ferreted out converge on Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Faraghānī (282-362/895-973), a source of much valuable information on the life and works of his own great teacher, the traditionist

¹ Cf. *KPA*, pp. 22 f. and references there cited. *PERF* Nos. 100 and 886-907 come from the reign of Muqtadir.

² Cf. the present writer's "A ninth-century fragment of the 'Thousand Nights,'" *JNES* VIII 148 f.

³ Extant 4th-century manuscripts on *paper* are not very numerous.

⁴ 'Arīb, *Ṣilat ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 168-70; father and son participated in the 319-20 campaign, and Aḥmad's account was drawn on by his contemporaries.

⁵ See Mas'ūdī VIII 249.

⁶ Mas'ūdī VIII 275; Mas'ūdī also gives a brief account of the reign of Muqtadir in *Tanbih*, pp. 376-89, written in 345/956, the last year of the author's life.

⁷ For the known manuscript sections of the *Akḥbār al-zamān*, see *GAL* S I 210; it is to be hoped that the lost Constantinople manuscript of 20 volumes, to which Brockelmann refers in his note, will soon be rediscovered. An outline of the contents of the *Akḥbār al-zamān* is given in Mas'ūdī I 2-4.

and historian Ṭabarī (d. 310/923).¹ Biographical notices on Faraghānī himself are few and much too brief. Khaṭīb gives him but three lines, from which, however, it is learned that he settled in Egypt.² Ibn 'Asākir in a seven-line notice gives his birth date as 282 (not 182, as in the printed text!) and describes him as "the commanding general of the army and the friend of Abū Ja'far al-Ṭabarī."³ He was, then, not only an aspiring traditionist and historian in Ṭabarī's circle but a man of action who later rose to the high destiny of a full-fledged general of the army. He must, therefore, have had a keen interest in contemporary military campaigns. Though both of the above-cited biographical notices mention his migration to Egypt, neither dates the event. However, the date can be judged from other, incidental references which indicate that the migration most probably took place between 310 and 320, that is, soon after the death of either Ṭabarī or Muqtadir. Faraghānī lived in Egypt until his death in 362/972.

It has long been known that Faraghānī wrote a continuation of Ṭabarī's history.⁴ The title of this work, now believed lost, is early quoted as *Mudhaiyal* but appears in later references as *Ṣilah*.⁵ 'Arīb (fl. 366/976) in his own *Ṣilah* or continuation of Ṭabarī, covering the years 303–20, that is, the very period that is involved here, draws freely on Faraghānī, to whom he readily acknowledges priority and indebtedness.⁶ 'Arīb further informs us that Faraghānī himself received much of his direct information of the campaign of 319–20, which ended in Muqtadir's death, from none other than the above-mentioned retainer of Mu'nis, the eyewitness reporter Aḥmad ibn Za'farān.⁷ This can only mean that Faraghānī himself was still in 'Irāq at the time of the campaign unless it can be proved that Aḥmad, his immediate source, migrated to Egypt soon after the death of his patron Mu'nis, a point on which the sources at hand are silent. Faraghānī's work must have been known to other contemporaries besides 'Arīb. It survived for several centuries, as its use by the several later sources mentioned herein testifies. Again, as Faraghānī lived the rest of his life in Egypt, and died in 362/972 at the age of seventy-eight, his writing activity in Egypt took place in that crucial fourth-century period in the history of papyrus as writing material. For, though papyrus was still in Egyptian use in the second quarter of the century, it all but completely yielded to paper in the second half of that same century. This, then, is the approximate end limit for the date of our fragment.

Turning once again to the fragment itself, we have first a medium fair papyrus in a carefully written book hand. The copy is by a scholar and for scholars, as the all but complete lack of dots and vowels indicates. It records at some length vivid yet sober and pertinent historical data of an engagement in a major campaign. It therefore does justice at one and the same time to the model set down by the great Ṭabarī himself and to the keen interest of a general in contemporary military affairs.

The two sets of facts, the external and the internal evidence of literary sources and of the papyrus respectively, lead one to suggest that the papyrus most probably represents a folio from either the original or a very early copy of Faraghānī's *Ṣilah* or continuation of Ṭabarī's history. It must be left to new discoveries and future scholars to prove or disprove conclusively any or all of these several suggestions relative to the authorship of the fragment.

¹ *Irshād* VI 426 f.; Ibn al-Athīr VIII 99; Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyah al-kubrā* II (Cairo, 1324) 136 f. For Faraghānī's dates see Ṭabarī, Vol. *Introductio* . . . (1901) p. xx, and Rhuvon Guest, "Relations between Persia and Egypt under Islam," in *A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne*, ed. T. W. Arnold and Reynold A. Nicholson (Cambridge, 1922) p. 173.

² Khaṭīb IX 389.

³ Ibn 'Asākir VII 277.

⁴ See *GAL* S I 217; Ṭabarī, Vol. *Introductio*, p. xx.

⁵ See 'Arīb, *Ṣilat ta'rikh al-Ṭabarī*, p. 156, for the first; *Irshād* VI 426 and Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* II 136, for the latter.

⁶ 'Arīb, *op. cit.* pp. 156, 170, 180, 183.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 170, where it is stated also that most of the accounts of the campaign current in 'Arīb's day trace back to this eyewitness source.

INDEX

- 'Abbās ibn Muḥammad, 89
 'Abbāsīd(s), 19–21, 30, 36, 55, 89, 92, 97, 103–4, 106, 112; — Empire, 90, 113; — period, 1, 19, 20, 25, 92; pre- — period, 6, 9, 15, 25, 26, 28
 Abbott, Nabia, xiii, xiv, 1–3, 5, 25, 28, 103
 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, *see* Ibn 'Abbās
 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 107
 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr, 75, 87
 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabi'ah, 82, 85
 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ, 28, 49
 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far, 105
 'Abd Allāh ibn Lahī'ah, 22
 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu'āwiyah, 102, 105–6
 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥfūẓ al-Bālawī, 51
 'Abd Allāh ibn Numair, 93
 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'id al-Umawī, 94
 'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaimān, 54
 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, 8, 28, 81, 83, 96
 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, 17
 'Abd Allāh al-Khaiwānī, 12
 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Marwān, 18, 19
 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Sa'ūd, 27
 'Abd al-Ḥakam, 91
 'Abd al-Ḥakam ibn 'Amr, 29
 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Kātib, 29
 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, xiv
 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān, 3, 10, 16–19, 27, 29, 36, 44, 55
 'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad, 75
 'Abd al-Mun'im, 36, 45
 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, 105
 'Abd al-Raḥīm al-Barqī, 63, 64, 98
 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abzī, 85, 90
 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf, 81, 83, 84, 86, 96, 97
 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Zaid, 51, 54
 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ziyād, 54
 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām, 75, 76
 'Abd al-Ṣamad ibn Ma'qil, 49
 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 107
 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Majīd al-Thaqafī, 107
 'Abduh, Muḥammad, 28, 103
 Abel, 42
 Abraham, 16
 Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Wāsiṭī, 24
 Abū Aḥmad al-Farrā', 107
 Abū 'Alī Ḥamid al-Harawī, 89
 Abū al-'Amaithal, 25
 Abū Bakr, 90, 104
 Abū Barā', 'Amir ibn Mālik ibn Ja'far, 68–70, 72
 Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, xiii, 105, 107
 Abū Ḥanīfah, 18, 92
 Abū Ḥasan al-Ziyādī, 24
 Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, 10, 47
 Abū Hurairah, 18, 28
 Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī, 82, 84, 86, 90
 Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr, *see* Manṣūr
 Abū Ja'far al-Ṭabarī, *see* Ṭabarī
 Abū Ja'far al-Warrāq, 91
 Abū Jahl ibn Hishām ibn al-Mughirah, 63
 Abū Lu'lu'ah, 81, 83, 97
 Abū Ma'shar, 75, 84
 Abū Mikhnaḥ, 8, 86, 90
 Abū Muḥammad, 12; *see also* Ibn Hishām
 Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī, 28
 Abū Naṣr, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh, 11
 Abū Nu'aim al-Iṣfahānī, xiii, 49, 103, 106
 Abū Qāsim (Muḥammad), 70
 Abū Qilābah, 23
 Abū Ṣāliḥ, 45–47, 52
 Abū Ṣāliḥ Dhakwān, 46
 Abū Shaikh ibn Thābit ibn al-Mundhir, 69
 Abū Sufyān, 68, 71, 78
 Abū Ṭāhir al-Jannābī, 113–15
 Abū Ṭālib, 104–6
 Abū 'Ubaid al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, 48
 Abū Yūsuf, 92, 93
 Abū al-Zinād, 53
 Abyssinia, 85
 Adam, 1, 7, 13, 34, 35, 40–48, 51, 54, 56, 90
 Adam's Peak, 41, 42, 47, 50
 Aden, 42
 Africa, North, 22, 27, 29, 54, 107
ahl al-'ilm, 8; *see also* 'ilm
ahl al-kitāb, *see* 'people of the Book'
ahl al-suffah, 28
 Ahlwardt, Wilhelm, 16
 Aḥmad Amīn, 23, 27, 28
 Aḥmad al-Barqī, 63, 64
 Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 107
 Aḥmad ibn Abī Khālid al-Aḥwal, 3
 Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, 104
 Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Dūlābī, 94, 98
 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Abī al-'Ajūz, 112
 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'id al-Hamdānī, 107–8; *see also* Ibn 'Uqdah
 Aḥmad ibn Za'farān, 115–16
 Aḥmad Zakī, 42
 'Aishah, 28, 105
akhbār, 4, 7, 18–20, 44; — and history, 4, 7–9, 14, 18, 19; *akhbārī* ('historian'), 9, 11, 12, 47
Akhbār 'Ubaid, xiii, 9–16, 19, 26; *see also* 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah
Akhbār al-zamān, 42, 115
 Akhtal, 73
 'Alawīyah, 105
 Alexander the Great, 18, 54; *Romance of* —, 50–55
 'Alī, Jawād, 7, 17, 24, 28
 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, 104
 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Madīnī, 53, 92
 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, 2, 7, 13, 82, 84, 85, 97, 100–107
 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Madā'inī, 75
 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Mas'ūd al-Khuzā'i, 29
 'Alī ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī, 24
 'Alī ibn Yalbuq, 113–14
 'Alids, 20, 86, 100–108
 Amedroz, H. F., xiii
 'Amilī, Muḥsin al-Amīn al-Ḥusainī al-, xiii
 Amīn, Aḥmad, 23, 27, 28

- 'Amir ibn Jurham al-Anṣārī, 12
 'Amir ibn Mālik, *see* Abū Barā'
 'Amir ibn al-Ṭufail, 68, 69, 72, 73
 'Amir al-Sha'bī, *see* Sha'bī
 'Ammār ibn Muḥammad ibn Mukhlad, 89
 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, 5, 10, 50, 82, 83, 85, 86
 'Amr ibn Maimūn al-Awdī, 25, 82–86, 90, 98
 'Amr ibn Umayyah al-Ḍamrī, 73
 'an' *anah*, 16, 108
 Anas ibn Mālik, 28, 48, 51, 72
 Anas ibn Mu'adh ibn Anas, 69, 72
 Anas ibn Mu'awiyah, 72
 Anistās Mārī al-Karmalī, 10, 11
ansāb, 14, 19
Ansāb, xiii, 64, 83, 85, 86
ansār, 69, 71, 72, 78
 'Aqabah, Meeting of, 25, 61–64
 Arab culture, vii, 14, 15, 18, 26–31; pre-'Abbāsīd —, 19–22, 26–30; pre-Islāmic —, 26–28, 31, 32
 Arabia, 27, 28, 31, 56
Arabian Nights, vii, 25, 56, 92
 Arabians, South, 9–11, 13
 Arabic papyri: collections of, vii, 31, 56; poetry in, 18, 30; *see also* *ḥadīth*
 Arberry, Arthur John, 55
 'arḍ, 93, 94, 99
 Ardabīl, 114
 'Arīb ibn Sa'd al-Qurṭubī, 113, 116
 Armenia, 113
 army organization, 112–13
 Arnold, Sir Thomas, 116
 Asad ibn Mūsā al-Umawī, 12, 16
 Ash'arī, 'Alī ibn Ismā'il al-, 105
 Asia, Central, 27
aṣl, 95
 Aṣmā'ī 'Abd al-Malik ibn Quraib al-, 17, 23
 Atiya, Aziz Suryal, 49
 'Aṭiyah ibn 'Abd 'Amr, 72
 'Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam, 86
 Aws, 28, 30, 74
 'Awwād, Gurgis, 23
 Awzā'ī, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muḥammad al-, 23
ayyām al-jāhiliyyah, 26
 Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī, 23
 Azerbaijān, 55, 113–14
 Badr, 65, 70, 71, 75, 78; Battle of —, 18, 28, 59, 70, 82, 86, 96
 Baghawī, Ḥusain ibn Mas'ūd al-, 6, 43
 Baghdād, 46, 89, 91, 103, 113
baī' al-'ilm, 24; *see also* 'ilm and book trade
 Baiḍāwī, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar al-, 42
 Bakka'ī, Ziyād ibn 'Abd Allāh al-, 89, 94
 Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 107–8
 Balādhurī, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-, xiii, 28
 Banū Abī Mu'ait, 82
 Banū 'Adī, 68
 Banū 'Āmir, 70
 Banū 'Amr ibn 'Awf, 69
 Banū 'Amr ibn Mabdhūl, 69
 Banū 'Amr ibn Mālik ibn Ishāq, 69
 Banū Ḍamrah, 68
 Banū Dīnār ibn al-Najjār, 69
 Banū Kilāb, 69
 Banū al-Naḍir, 60, 65, 69, 70, 73, 74, 78
 Banū al-Najjār, 69
 Banū Qainuqā', 59, 60
 Banū Razīq, 72
 Banū Sā'idah, 68, 69
 Banū Sulaim, 68, 69
 Banū Zuraiq, 69, 72
 Barbier de Meynard, Charles, xiv, 21
 Baring-Gould, Sabine, 41
 Barmakids, 91
 Barqah, 63
 Barqī, 9–11, 15, 16, 63, 98; 'Abd al-Rahīm al—, 63, 64, 98; Aḥmad al—, 63, 64; Muḥammad al—, 16, 63, 64
basmalah, 2, 16, 92
 Baṣrah, 17, 18, 81, 107
 Battle of Badr, *see* Badr
 Battle of Ḥarrah, 17
 Battle of Khaibar, 77, 105
 Battle of Ṣiffin, 105
 Battle of the Trench, 71, 72
 Battle of Uḥud, *see* Uḥud
 Baudh (Būdh, Naudh), 41, 42, 48
 Baumstark, Anton, 50
 Becker, Carl Heinrich, 22
 Bell, Richard, xiii
 Berlin, 11
 Bezold, Carl, 47
 Bi'r Ma'ūnah, 5, 65, 68–70, 72, 73, 76–78
 Bīrūnī, 27
 Bishr ibn Marwān, 17, 19
 Björkman, Walther, 29
 Blachère, Régis, 1, 21
 book(s): format of, 2; trade, 24, 54; *see also* *warrāq*
 'books of Allāh', 54
 Bowen, Harold, 113
 Breasted, James Henry, vii
 British Museum, vii, 11
 Brockelmann, Carl, xiii, 21, 25
 Budge, Sir E. A. Wallis, 48
 Būdh, *see* Baudh
 Buhl, Frants, 64
 Bukhārā, 46
 Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-, xiii, 8, 10, 53, 77, 98, 107
 Burak, 62
 Caetani, Prince Leone, xiii, 77, 83, 86
 Cain, 42
 Cairo, vii
 Caspari, Carl Paul, 52
 Cave of Treasure, 47, 48, 50, 51
 Ceylon, 42, 48
 Cheikho, Louis, 21
 Christian Arab literature, 2, 27, 30, 31, 46–51, 54–56
 Christians, 20, 27, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 54, 55, 59; *see also* 'people of the Book'
 Companions of Muḥammad, 2, 8, 20, 26, 28, 29, 45, 48, 70, 71, 85, 104
 Courteille, Pavet de, xiv
daftar, 21–24, 29, 48
 Daghfal, 10, 14
 Ḍaḥḥāk ibn 'Abd 'Amr, 77
 Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Muzāḥim, 52

- Daḥlān, Aḥmad ibn Zainī al-, 71
 Ḍajanān, 68, 71
 Damascus, 49
 Ḍamrī, Makhshī ibn 'Umar al-, 68, 71, 72, 78
 Ḍārimī, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-, 36
 David-Weill, Jean, 2, 22
 Dederling, Sven, 36
 Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-, xiii, xiv
dhakara, 13, 16, 21, 22, 53
 Dhū al-Jināḥain, *see* Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib
 Dhū al-Qarnain, 53, 54; *see also* Alexander the Great
 diacritical marks, 1, 32, 38, 57, 61, 65, 100, 109
ḍiḥwān, 10, 21, 52

 Egypt, 16, 18, 23, 27, 28, 31, 37, 51, 59, 90-92, 95, 98,
 107-8, 113, 115-16; Egyptian sources, 87, 91
 Eisenberg, Isaac, 41, 59
 Ethiopic texts, 41
 Eve, 1, 7, 38-48, 54, 56

 Faḍl ibn Sahl Dhū al-Riyāsatain, 4
 Faḍl ibn Yaḥyā, 91
 Faraghānī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-, 1, 109, 115-16
 Fārisī, 'Umārah ibn Wathīmah al-, 37
 Farrā', Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-, 22
 Fāṭimah, 104
 Fāṭimids, 107, 113
 Finkel, Joshua, 24
fiqh, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 45
 fire, 35, 41
 Fischer, August, 17, 87
 Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht, 42
 Flügel, Gustav, xiii, 46
 formula of blessing, 2, 42, 44, 63, 74, 76, 92, 104
 Friedlaender, Israel, 46, 50-54, 56, 106
 Fück, Johann, 6, 7, 26, 87, 92
 Fugitives, Meccan, 71, 72
 Furqān, Day of al-, 82; *see also* Battle of Badr
 Fyzee, Asaf A. A., 105

 Gabriel, 44
 Garshūnī text, 47
ghār al-kanz, 47; *see also* Cave of Treasure
 Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid al-, 34, 42
 Gibb, Sir Hamilton, 6, 17
 Gibson, Margaret Dunlop, 41, 46-49
 Goeje, Michael Jan de, xiii, xiv, 12, 17, 20, 28, 29,
 72, 113
 Götze, Albrecht, 46, 48
 Gog and Magog, 55
 Goiten, S. D. F., xiii
 Goldziher, Ignaz, xiii, 7, 10, 26, 92, 93, 108
 Gottwaldt, Joseph M. E., 113
 Graf, Georg, 47, 48
 Greek texts, 27, 30, 41, 47, 49, 53, 56
 Griffini, Eugenio, 107
 Grohmann, Adolf, 2, 3, 5, 61
 Guest, Rhuvon, 113, 116
 Guidi, Ignazio, xiii
 Guillaume, Alfred, 9, 16

 ḥadīth, 14, 16-18, 24, 28; — and history, 6-9, 18, 19,
 21, 98, 99; — and 'ilm, 8, 22; — and *khabar*, 4, 7,
 19, 20; — *al-Nabī*, 7, 28; — papyri, vii, 22, 23, 30,
 56, 98, 99; — *al-ṣaḥābah*, 7; writing of —, 7-9, 17,
 18, 21-24; *see also* Tradition
 Ḥafṣah, 28
 Ḥaidarābād, 11, 13
 Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, 15-18, 22, 29, 44
 Ḥajjī Khalīfah, Muṣṭafā ibn 'Abd 'Allāh, xiii
 Ḥakam ibn Sa'd, 69
 Ḥakam ibn 'Utaibah, 23
 Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, 85
 Ḥalabī, Nūr al-Dīn al-, 71, 77
 Ḥallāj, Ḥusain ibn Manṣūr al-, 17
 Hamdānī, Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-, 10
 Hamdānids, 113
 Ḥammād al-Rāwīyah, 18
 Ḥammād ibn Zaid, 107
 Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī, 45, 113
 Ḥarām ibn Miḥān al-Anṣārī, 68, 69, 72
 Harding, Gerald Lankester, 27
 Ḥārith ibn al-Ṣimmah, 69
 Ḥarrah, 68; Battle of —, 17
 Ḥarrān, inscription of, 30
 Ḥārūn al-Rashīd, 19, 92
 Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, 16, 17, 23, 25, 36, 51-54
 Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad, 89
 Ḥasan al-Sandūbī, 7
 Haschmi, Mohammed Jahia, 27
 Hāshimites, 19 f.
 Ḥassān ibn Thābit, 5, 69, 71, 72
 Hauser, Elizabeth B., vii
 Hebrew, 28
 Heidelberg papyrus collection, vii, 2, 4, 22, 26
 Helpers of Medinah, *see* *anṣār*
 Ḥijāz, 6, 25, 45, 91
 Hilāl ibn al-'Ajūz, 110-15
 Ḥimyarite texts, 30; Ḥimyarites, 11, 51
 Ḥīrah, 89
 Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik, 17-91, 24, 25, 55
 Hishām ibn 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, 17, 25, 78
 Hitti, Philip Khuri, 27, 50, 112
 Horovitz, Joseph, 6, 15, 17, 26, 43
 Houtsma, Martijn Theodor, xiv, 46
 Huart, Clément, xiv
 Hūd, 13, 16
 Ḥudaibīyah, 82, 85, 86
 Ḥuḍaid, 42
 Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl, 22, 23
 Ḥusain ibn Ḥasan al-'Awfī, 92, 93
 Ḥuṣaiṣ, 42
 Ḥuṣrī, Ibrāhīm ibn 'Alī al-, 4

 Iblīs, *see* Satan
 Ibn 'Abbās, 11, 14, 23, 28, 29, 41, 45-47, 51, 52; 102-3;
Tafsīr of —, 41, 47
 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 28
 Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, xiii
 Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 101-3, 107-8
 Ibn 'Abdūs al-Jahshiyārī, 115
 Ibn Abī Dā'ūd, 21, 22
 Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, 103
 Ibn Abī al-Sāj, 113-15
 Ibn al-'Alā, 23
 Ibn 'Asākir, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan, xiii, 36, 47, 73
 Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izz al-Dīn, xiii, 23, 48, 98
 Ibn Bābūyah, 54, 105

- Ibn al-Barqī, 63; *see also* Barqī
 Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, 17
 Ibn Farḥūn, Ibrāhīm ibn 'Alī, 16
 Ibn Ḥadīd, 28
 Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī, xiii, 12, 46
 Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad, xiii, 18, 43, 92, 96, 98
 Ibn Ḥazm, 105
 Ibn Hishām, 'Abd al-Malik, xiv, 7, 8, 16, 37, 70, 91, 98; — and *Akhbār 'Uбайд*, 11–15; — and the *Tijān*, 12, 13, 36, 51; — and the *Sīrah*, 1, 7, 8, 12, 25, 61–64, 70, 76, 78, 88–91, 94, 98
 Ibn Hudhail, 112
 Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad, 5, 6, 8–10, 19, 20, 24–26, 37, 43, 45, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55; — and *Akhbār 'Uбайд*, 11–16; — and historical method, 9, 13, 15, 19, 25, 26, 44, 53, 78, 79, 97; — and the *Maghāzī*, 70–76, 78, 79, 87–91, 93, 94, 98; — and the *Mubtadā'*, 37, 47, 87–90, 94, 98; — and the *Romance of Alexander*, 47, 51, 52, 55; — and the *Sīrah*, 8, 15, 74, 75, 78, 87–91, 94; *see also* *Tārīkh al-khulafā'*
 Ibn al-Jall, 62
 Ibn al-Jauzī, 41, 83
 Ibn Khaldūn, 6, 7, 20, 27–29, 77, 112
 Ibn Lahī'ah, 'Abd Allāh, 22
 Ibn Manẓūr, 48
 Ibn Miskawaih, 7, 86
 Ibn Mu'āwīyah, *see* Ja'far 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu'āwīyah
 Ibn al-Muqaffa', 17, 18, 29, 50, 55, 56
 Ibn Muqlah, 3–5, 25
 Ibn al-Qirriyah, 17
 Ibn Qutaibah, 'Abd Allāh ibn Muslim, xiv, 10, 14, 36, 72, 77
 Ibn Rustah, 29
 Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad, xiii, 8, 18, 26, 28, 44–47, 62, 70, 76, 98
 Ibn Šā'id al-Qurtubī, 21, 27
 Ibn Taghrībīrdī, Abū al-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf, xiii, 46
 Ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, 105
 Ibn 'Uqdah, 1, 5, 100, 108
 Ibn Wahb, 'Abd Allāh, 2, 22
 'Ibrah, 6, 7, 43
 Ibrāhīm ibn Sa'd, 89, 91
 Idrīsids, 107
 'Ikrimah, 28
 'ilm, 8, 10, 19, 25; — *al-akhbār*, 37; — and *ḥadīth*, 8, 19, 22; sale of —, 24
 imlā', 22
 'Imrān ibn Ḥaṭṭan, 20
 India, 27, 42, 48
 interpolations, 16, 25, 63, 64
 'Irāq, 6, 22, 25, 27, 55, 89–92, 95, 98, 106, 115–16; 'Irāqī sources, 83, 87, 90, 98
 'Isā ibn 'Abd Allāh, 107–8
 Ishāq ibn Bishr, 37, 46, 51, 52
 Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili, 46
 Ishāq ibn Ḥammād, 92
 Islāmic historiography, 1, 5–9, 63, 74–79, 87–91; — and biography, 8, 14; — and *ḥadīth*, 6–9, 18, 21, 98, 99; — and Mu'āwīyah, 9–17; — and poetry, 14, 15, 17, 18, 68, 69, 71–73, 110–12; — and the Umayyads, 16–19; — and Umayyad culture, 19–21, 26–31, 55, 56; — and written transmission, 9–11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 44–56, 88, 90–99
 Ismā'il ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān (= Suddī?), 51
 Ismā'il ibn Abī Idrīs, 107
 Ismā'il ibn Abī Uwais, 107–8
 Ismā'īliyah, 107
 isnād, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 44, 45, 47, 51, 104, 107–8
 Israel, 31
 Isrāfil, 44
 'Izrā'il, 44
 Jacobsen, Thorkild, vii
 Jaddah, 42
 Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib, 104, 106
 Ja'far ibn Sulaimān, 17
 Jāhīz, 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19–22, 24, 27, 29, 84
 Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, 19
 Jahmiyah, 19
 jama'a, 21, 22
 Jannābī, *see* Abū Ṭāhir al-Jannābī
 Jannād, 18
 Jazīrah, 55, 89
 Jeffery, Arthur, 21
 Jesus, 44, 49
 Jews, 1, 20, 27, 28, 30, 41, 42, 47, 48, 54, 57–59, 70, 73, 103–4; *see also* 'people of the Book'
 Jināhiyah, 106
 John, Bishop of Seville, 50
 Jong, P. de, 28
 Jordan, 31
 Joseph, 44
 Jubair, 52
 Juwaibar ibn Sa'id, 52
 Juwairiyah ibn Qudāmah, 83, 90
 Juynboll, T. W. J., xiii
 Ka'ab al-Akhbār, 8, 59
 Ka'b ibn Zaid, 69, 72
 Kalbī, Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-, 25, 42, 44–48, 50, 52
 Kalbī, Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-, 10, 25, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55; *Tafsīr of* —, 45, 47, 51–54
 Kalīlah wa-Dimnah, 23, 24, 55
 Karabacek, Joseph, 36, 92
 Karmalī, Anistās Mārī al-, 10, 11
 Kattānī, Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-, 29
 khabar, *see* akhbār and ḥadīth
 Khadijah, 43
 Khaḍīr, 54
 Khaibar, 77, 104; Battle of —, 105
 Khālid ibn al-Haiyāj, 18
 Khālid ibn Ma'rān, 22
 Khālid ibn Yazīd, 19–21, 24, 27, 29
 Khārijites, 7, 20, 29
 Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, al-, xiii, 22, 89, 91, 94, 95, 116
 Khazraj, 28, 30, 74
 Khuda Bukhsh, Salahuddin, 112
 Khurāsān, 12, 91
 Khuzā'i, Ma'bad al-, 68, 71
 Kindī, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-, 91, 113
 Kisā'i, 37
 kitāb, 23; *see also* book(s)
 Kitāb ḥadīth Adam wa-wuldihi, 48
 Kraeling, Carl H., vii
 Krehl, Ludolf, xiii
 Kremer, Alfred von, xiv, 112

- Krenkow, Fritz, 11–13, 15, 16, 25, 51
 Kūfah, 17, 19, 23, 45, 82, 85, 107; Kūfan sources, 83, 86, 90, 97, 108
 Kūfic script, 4, 49
 Kuraib, 23
 Kurd 'Alī, Muḥammad, 29

 Lammens, Henri, 50, 85
 Lane, Edward W., xiv
 Leach, Maria, 42
 Levin, Bernhard, 49
 libraries, 20, 23, 24, 29
 Lichtenstädter, Ilse, 14
 Littmann, Enno, 27
 Löfgren, Oscar, 10, 11, 13
 Löwinger, Samuel, 53
 London, vii
 Luqmān, 48

 Ma'bad al-Khuzā'i, 68, 71
 Mackensen, Ruth Stellhorn, 11, 12, 20
 Madā'inī, 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-, 75
maghāzī, 15, 17, 18, 65–76, 87, 88
 Magians, 20, 54
 Mahdī, 36, 89, 90, 92
 Mahdī, Muḥsin, 7
majāl, 47, 48
 Makhshī ibn 'Umar al-Ḍamrī, 68, 71, 72, 78
 Makhūl, 10, 12
 Makhzūmites, 85, 86
 Malan, Solomon Caesar, 41, 48
 Malāṭī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-, 36, 43, 105
 Mālik ibn Anas, 25, 103
 Mālik ibn Dīnār, 24, 49
 Mālik ibn Thābit, 77
 Ma'mar ibn Rāshid, 1, 65, 75, 76, 87
 Ma'mūn, 4, 21, 112
 Manchester, vii
 Maṣṣūr, 21, 23, 55, 56, 88, 89, 92, 94, 103
 Maqdisī, al-Muṭahhar ibn Ṭāhir al-, xiv, 9, 13, 37, 45, 88
 Maqrīzī, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-, 114
 Margoliouth, D. S., xiii
 Marwān II, 29
maṣḥaf, 48
 Māsiriwaih, 27
 Maslamah ibn 'Abd al-Malik, 18, 19, 55
 Massignon, Louis, 17
 Mas'ūd ibn Sa'd, 77
 Mas'ūdī, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain al-, xiv, 9, 10, 13, 15, 21, 37, 42, 45, 51, 88, 112, 115
 Matthes, B. F., xiii
matn, 9
 Mauṣil, 113
mawālī, 28
 Māwardī, 88
 Mawlawy 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, xiv
 Mecca, 17, 28, 68, 71, 82, 103; Victory of —, 82, 85
 Medina, 17, 24, 25, 30, 43, 53, 68–71, 73, 78, 81, 87–90; Medinan sources, 87, 90
 Mélamède, Gertrude, 2, 64
 Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, 50
 Mercier, Louis, 112–13
 Meynard, Charles Barbier de, xiv
 Mez, Adam, 92

 Michael (angel), 44
 Milan, University of, vii, 2, 3, 26
 Mingana, Alphonse, 24, 47
 miniature letter forms, 1, 61, 65
 Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, 82, 85, 86, 96
 Miṣr, 63
 Monneret de Villard, Ugo, 47
 Moses, 43
 Mu'adh ibn Mā'is, 69
 Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, 5, 9–17, 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 56, 82, 85, 86, 97, 103, 105
 Mu'awwidh ibn al-Ḥārith, 63
mubaiyaḍah, 74
mubārakah, 112
 Muḥtadā', 91; — of Ibn Ishāq, *see* Ibn Ishāq; — of Ishāq ibn Bishr, 46, 52; — of Wahb ibn Munabbih, 26, 45, 87, 88
 Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbī, 89
 Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah, 81, 83, 86
 Muḥallab ibn Abī Ṣufrah, 24
 Muḥammad (Prophet), 1, 4–7, 11, 13–17, 20, 23, 25–30, 43, 45, 49, 59, 64–79, 82, 84–87, 96, 99, 100–108
 Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī, 29
 Muḥammad 'Abduh, 28, 103
 Muḥammad al-Barqī, 16, 63, 64
 Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ('Alid), 103
 Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Numair, 93
 Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 107
 Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Dūlābī, 94, 98
 Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, 14, 29, 77, 78
 Muḥammad ibn Ḥamīd, 94, 97, 98
 Muḥammad ibn Sa'id al-Umawī, 92–94
 Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn, 41, 44
 Muḥammad ibn 'Umrān al-Marzabānī, 91
 Muir, William, 17, 26
munāwalah, 22, 25
 Mundhir ibn 'Amr, 68, 69, 72
 Mundhir ibn Muḥammad al-Anṣārī, 73
 Mu'nis al-Khādim, 111–16
 Muqaddasī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-, 20, 55
 Muqātil ibn Sulaimān, 51–55
 Muqtadir, 5, 107, 109, 113–16
 Mūsā ibn Ja'far al-Sādiq, 37
 Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah, 23, 70, 74, 78, 87
musawwadah, 106
 Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, xiv, 8, 77
 Musta'in, 112
 Mūtah, 106
 Mu'ṭasim, 92
 Mutawakkil, 24

 Nābighah al-Dhubaynī, 48
 Nadīm, Muḥammad ibn Ishāq al-, xiii, 14, 23, 88, 108
 Najd, 42, 69, 70, 77, 85
 Nallino, Carlo Alfonso, 24
 Nasā'i, 36
 Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim, 107
 Nau, François Nicolas, 50
 Naubakhtī, Ḥaṣan ibn Mūsā al-, 105
 Naudh (Baudh), 42, 48
 Nawawī, Yahyā ibn Sharaf al-, xiv, 35
 Nicholson, Reynold A., 12, 116
 Noah, 47
 Nöldeke, Theodor, 46, 50, 55

- Nu'aim ibn Mas'ūd, 67, 71
 Nuwairi, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-, 3
- Obermann, Julian, 16
 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, vii
 Oriental Institute, vii
 O'Shaughnessy, Thomas, 50
- Paris, vii
 Pavet de Courteille, xiv
 'people of the Book,' 44, 49, 54
 Persia, 13, 27, 91; Persian texts, 18, 27, 47, 50, 53, 55, 56
 Peters, Curt, 50
 Pidal, Ramón Menéndez, 50
 punctuation devices, 1, 2
- Qāhir, 113
 Qanāt, 69, 73
 Qaramatians, 113-15
 Qāsim ibn Nuṣair, 52
 Qatādah ibn Du'āmāh, 52, 53
 Qaṭrī, 29
 Quda'id, 68, 71
 Quraish, 10, 14, 20, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 85
 Quraishites at Bi'r Ma'ūnah, 78
quṣṣās, 53 f.
 Qutaibah ibn Muslim, 11, 12
 Quṭbah (scribe), 92
 Quṭbah ibn 'Abd 'Amr, 69, 72
- Rabī'ah ibn Abī Barā', 69, 73
 Rabī' ibn Ḥabīb, 21
 Rabin, Chaim, 1
 Raḍwān, 96; Oath of —, 82, 86, 96
rāyah, 104-5
 Rescher, Oscar, 77
 Rifā'ah ibn al-Ḥārith, 63
riḥlah, 98
 Ritter, Hellmut, 16, 36, 105
 Rosenthal, Franz, 6, 7, 14, 16, 20, 93
Romance of Alexander, 50-55
 Ruqqīyah, 86, 96
- Ṣabīgh ibn 'Isl, 20
 Sachau, Eduard, xiii, 6, 26, 70
 Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, 73, 82-84, 86, 96
ṣaḥīfah, 21-23, 48
 Saḥīr al-Qalamāwī, 20
 Sahl ibn 'Amir, 69, 77
 Sa'id ibn Abī 'Arūbah, 52
 Sa'id ibn Bashīr, 52
 Sa'id ibn al-Musayyib, 41, 43, 44
 Sa'id ibn 'Uthmān, 12
 Sa'id ibn Yaḥyā al-Umawī, 94
 Salamah ibn al-Faḍl, 90, 94-96, 98
 Salḥānī, Anton, 73
 Ṣāliḥ (prophet), 13
 Sālīmī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḥumaid al-, 21
sam', 93, 94, 97, 99
 Sam'ānī, 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Abī Bakr al-, xiv
 Samar (Shamar), 11, 12
 Samarqand, 11, 12
 Sāmarrā', 92
- Sanskrit, 27
 Satan (Iblīs), 35, 41, 43, 70, 74, 96
 Sayyid Zain al-'Abidin al-Mūsawī, 11
 Schacht, Joseph, 18
 Schaefer, Hans Heinrich, 64
Schatzhöhle, 47; *see also* Cave of Treasure
 scripts, literary, 1-5, 32, 37, 49, 57, 61, 80, 109; *jāmi'* —, 4; *Kūfic* —, 4, 49; *manthūr* —, 4; *mudawwar al-ṣaghīr* —, 4, 5; *muṭlaq* —, 4; *naskhī* —, 3-5; North Arabic —, 27, 30; *riyāsī* —, 4
 Seele, Keith C., vii
 Seif, Theodor, 50, 51
 Seville, Bishop of, 50
 Sha'bī, 'Amir al-, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 41, 44
 Shafā', 28
 Shahrastānī, 105
 Shaibānī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-, 23
 Shākir, Aḥmad Muḥammad, 43
 Shamar (Samar), 11
 Shaqīq ibn Salamah, 96
 Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, 103
 Sharīf al-Raḍī, 103
 Shī'ites, 1, 2, 5, 37, 54, 100-108
 Shu'aib ibn Dīnār, 24
 Shu'bah ibn Ḥajjāj, 83
 Ṣiffīn, Battle of, 105
 Sinai, 48, 49
sinā'āt, 19
siyar, 18, 45, 88; *see also* Ibn Hishām and Ibn Ishāq
 Smith, Sidney, 31
 Somogyi, Joseph, 54
 South Arabia, *see* Arabia
 Spain, 20, 21, 27, 50, 54
 Sprenger, Aloys, xiii, xiv, 17, 26
 Sprengling, Martin, vii
 Steinschneider, Moritz, 77
 Strothmann, Rudolf, 105, 107
 Stummvoll, Josef, vii
 Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn al-, 116
 Suddī, Ismā'il ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-, 41, 45, 49, 51, 52, 59
 Suddī, Muḥammad ibn Marwān al-, 47
 Sufyān al-Thaurī, 23
 Sufyān ibn Thābit, 77
 Ṣuhaib ibn Sinān, 82, 84
 Suhailī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Abd Allāh al-, 77
 Sulaimān ibn Miḥhān, 69
 Sultan, Jamil, 103
 Sumairah ibn al-Ja'd, 29
summah, 6, 17, 28
 Sunnite literature, 5, 54, 106-7
sūq al-warraqīn, 24; *see also* *warraq*
 Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-, 6, 16, 41, 47
 Syria, 10, 22, 27, 31, 81, 91, 92
 Syriac, 27, 28, 41, 46, 47, 49, 53, 56
- Tabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-, xiv, 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 17, 26, 28, 44-47, 49, 59, 71, 75, 77, 85, 90, 94, 95, 97, 98, 116; *see also* *Tafsīr*
Tafsīr: of Ibn 'Abbās, 41, 47; of Kalbī, 45, 47, 53, 55; of Muqātil ibn Sulaimān, 51, 53; of Suddī, 41, 45; of Ṭabarī, 36, 37, 41, 45
 Ṭaḥa al-Ḥājirī, 10
 Ṭaḥāwī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-, 44, 92

- Ṭalḥah ibn al-Zubair, 82
 Ṭalībīyah, 101, 103, 105; Ṭalībīyīn, 105
 ṭaliq, 81, 85
 Ṭanbīh, xiv, 15, 20
 Ṭa'rīkh al-Khulafā', 1, 5, 13, 25, 80-86; character of —, 89-91, 97; date of — papyrus, 91, 95, 98; early transmission of —, 92-95; origin of —, 89-91, 95, 96; significance of —, 96-99
 tashjīr, 14
 tauqī', 10
 ta'wīl, 15, 19
 Ṭayālisi, Ibn al-Jarūd al-, 43
 terminology of written transmission, 21-24, 48, 52, 53, 92-95; 'ard, 93, 94, 99; aṣl, 95; daftar, 21-24, 29, 48; dhakara, 16, 21, 22, 53; imlā', 22; jama'a, 21; kitāb, 23, 24, 48; majāll, 47, 48; maṣḥaf, 21, 48; mubaiyadah, 74; munāwalah, 22, 25; musawwadah, 106; ṣahīfah, 21-23, 48; tadwīn, 10, 21, 52, 53; tauqī', 10, 95; wirāqah, 3, 24, 25
 Tha'ālibī, 'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad al-, 22
 Tha'lab, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā, 18
 Tha'labī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-, 35, 37, 54, 59
 Thamūd, 10, 13
 Thilo, Johann Karl, 44
 Thornberg, C. J., xiii
 Tījān, xiv, 10, 11, 36, 45, 51
 Tirmidhī, Muḥammad ibn 'Isā al-, xiv, 23
 Torrey, Charles Cutler, 48
 Tradition, 7-9, 16-19, 21, 107; see also ḥadīth
 Ṭufail ibn Sa'd, 69, 77
 Turks, 113
 Ṭurtushī, Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd al-, 49
 Ṭūsī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-, xiv
 Ṭuwaīq, 111-14
 'Ubaid, Aḥmad, xiii
 'Ubaid ibn Sharyah, xiii, 9-17, 20, 26, 27, 56
 Uḥud, 69, 73; Battle of —, 70, 72, 78, 82, 86, 96
 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz ('Umar II), 18, 19
 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ('Umar I), 5, 7, 8, 20, 25, 28, 80-87, 96, 97, 102-3
 'Umārah ibn Wathīmah al-Fārisī, 37
 'Umārah ibn Zaid, 47, 50-56
 Umawī, 92, 94, 98; 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'id al—, 94; Asad ibn Mūsā al—, 12, 16; Muḥammad ibn Sa'id al—, 92-94; Yaḥyā ibn Sa'id al—, 93-96
 Umayyads, 1, 9, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27-30, 55, 56, 82, 86, 92, 98, 103, 105; see also Islāmic historiography
 Umm al-Banīn, 69
 Umm Hānī, 46
 Umm Sam'ān, 109
 'Urwah ibn Asmā' ibn al-Ṣalt, 69
 'Urwah ibn al-Zubair, 8, 15-20, 26, 29, 49, 99
 'Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān, 23
 'Uthmān ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Mauhab, 96
 'Uthmān ibn Abī Sa'id al-Khaiwānī, 12
 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān, 28, 82-87, 96, 97, 102, 104
 Vienna, vii
 Violet, Bruno, 49
 Vloten, Gerlof van, 10, 15
 Vöobus, Arthur, 50
 Vogliano, Achille, 3
 vowel signs, 1, 35, 36, 57
 Wahb ibn Munabbih, 1, 8, 16, 20, 26, 36, 37, 45, 47, 49, 51, 54; — and the *Isrā'īlīyāt*, 36, 45, 59; — and the *Mubtadā'*, 26, 45, 87, 88
 Walid I, 12, 16-18, 29
 Walid II, 18, 19, 23, 24
 Walid ibn 'Uqbah, 96
 Wāqidī, Muḥammad ibn 'Umar, xiv, 9, 20, 23, 25, 26, 63, 70, 74-76, 78, 96, 98, 108
 warrāq, 3, 4, 22, 24, 25, 95; see also book(s)
 Wāsiṭ, 24
 Wāthiq, 55
 Watt, W. Montgomery, 17
 Wellhausen, Julius, xiv
 Wensinck, Arent Jan, 6, 85
 women, 41, 105
 Wright, William, 52
 Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand, xiv, 62-64
 Yaḥyā ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭabarī, 111-12
 Yaḥyā ibn 'Alī, 104
 Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan, 107-8
 Yaḥyā ibn Sa'id al-Umawī, 93-96
 Yalbuq, 110-15
 Ya'qūbī, Aḥmad ibn Wāḍiḥ al-, xiv, 45, 46, 92
 Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh, xiii, xiv, 9, 14
 Yathrib, 71
 Yazīd ibn Abī Muslim, 22
 Yazīd ibn Ḥabīb, 23
 Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah, 14
 Yemen, 42, 51, 76, 85, 72; Yemenites, 10, 12, 76
 Yūnis ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān, 37
 Yūsuf ibn al-Ḥakam, 29
 Zabad, inscription of, 30
 Za'farān, 115
 Zaid ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain, 102, 105
 Zaid ibn Thābit, 28
 Zaidites, 105-6, 108
 Zakī, Aḥmad, 42
 Zambaur, Eduard Karl Max von, 104
 Ziyād ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'i, 89, 94
 Zubair ibn al-'Awwām, 82
 Zuhri, Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-, 17-20, 23, 25, 26, 74-76, 78, 79, 84, 87, 88, 90, 99



VERSO



RECTO

DOCUMENT I

Courtesy of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien

DOCUMENT 2

VERSO

RECTO



VERSO



RECTO

DOCUMENT 4

Courtesy of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien



VERSO

DOCUMENT 5



RECTO

DOCUMENT 5

DOCUMENT 6

VERSO

لا يظفر على الصراط...
 فما جاء من حجة...
 الصبح...
 دونه...
 راقية...
 الناس...
 لا يظفر...
 وحده...
 راقية...
 النظم...
 فسر...
 ما...
 في...
 في...
 في...

RECTO

DOCUMENT 7

VERSO

RECTO