

Abraham's Sacrifice of his Son and Related Issues

By Suliman Bashear (Jerusalem)

1. Introduction

The idea that Abraham was tried by a divine order to sacrifice his son was expressed in Quran 37/101-7¹). As for the question who was the one meant by it, Muslim traditional sources point to two divergent views: one which basically agrees with *Genesis 22* where the name of Isaac was explicitly stated and another which says that the one meant was rather Ismā'il.

The existence of such divergence has long been noted by modern scholars and interpreters of the Quran²). Few of them either limited themselves to making a rough note of the matter or, especially those who consulted basically late commentaries, simply stating that "the Mohammedan theory is that it was Ishmael and not Isaac . . .³). Following Goldziher, others expressed the opinion that Isaac was the one initially meant though the idea that it referred to Ismā'il eventually emerged victorious⁴); an opinion which drew also upon R. Bell's view that verses 37/100-7 were "a later Medinese addition."⁵)

Occasionally, some scholars commented upon certain related issues.⁶) However, no thorough examination was done concerning the development

¹) Especially 37/107: "And we ransomed him with a mighty sacrifice". See A. J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, London 1955, 2/153-4.

²) E. g. A. Geiger's work which was first published in 1833 in German and translated into English as *Judaism and Islam*, Madras 1898, 103-6.

³) E. H. Palmer, *The Koran*, London 1928. See also the relevant note by E. D. Ross to G. Sale's: *The Koran*, London and New York 1877, 439, n. (6); D. L. Bonelli, *Il Corano*, Milano 1960, 419, n. (1); H. A. R. Gibb and J. H. Kraemer, ed., *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, Leiden 1974, 175, 178-9; and the references cited therein.

⁴) J. Goldziher, *Die Richtungen . . .*, Leiden 1952, 81, n. (3), (4); J. Walker, *Bible Characters in the Koran*, London 1931, 52-3; W. M. Watt, "Ishāk", *E.I.*, new ed., 4/109-10; Rudi Paret, "Ismā'il", in *ibid*, 4/185-6.

⁵) R. Bell, *The Quran . . .*, Edinburgh 1953, 2/446, n. (2) (4); *idem*, *Introduction to the Quran*, Edinburgh 1953, 161-2.

⁶) R. Bell raised the possibility that Quran 37/101 contains "a covert reference to the running between Safa and Marwa" and that "*dhībḥ 'azīm*" in Quran 37/107

of the two main currents in Muslim traditional exegesis beyond Goldziher's initial note that the pro-Ishaq view was brought in the form of a tradition of 'Abbās from the Prophet and of Abū Hurayra from Ka'b while to Ibn 'Abbās the two contradictory views were attributed.

The present enquiry aims to carry this task out by examining the extremely extensive material on this issue brought by a wide variety of *tafsīr*, *ḥadīth*, historiographical and other traditional sources which tackle the problem of who was the sacrifice (*al-dhabīh*) or rather the ransomed (*al-mufaddā*), where and how was the act committed and other related issues. Such a task is justified also because, to all intents, these issues were crucial in the process of the emergence of Islam as an independent national Arabian religion related to Ibrāhīm through his son, Ismā'īl, father of the Arabs, and of sanctifying Mecca as a place connected with the Abrahamic ritual of sacrifice which is symbolically repeated by Muslims during the *ḥajj* ritual. In order to do so, however, the arduous task of investigating the apparently uncontrollable chains of *isnāds* and authorities on material originally coming from different genres and moulding into the traditional forms that has reached us in, is simply unavoidable. Limiting oneself to pointing out the conflicting currents and tendencies in early Islam just by pooling the relevant material on a given issue is, in my opinion, not satisfactory for the student of Islam anymore. For, almost forty years after Schact, it is high time to apply the same method of dating traditions in fields other than *fiqh*⁷).

2. *The Prophet, Companions, or Successors?*

2.1. Few compilers of *tafsīr* as well as other works note that those who held a pro-Ismā'īl view drew upon the prophetic *ḥadīth* "*anā ibnu al-dhabīḥayu*" (I am the son of two sacrifices) which they often cite without traditional *isnād* or source.⁸) But making such a note does not necessarily mean

may refer to the pilgrimage sacrifice; *The Quran* . . . , ibid. J. M. Rodwell, in his turn points to the existence of a Midrashic view by Rabbi Joshua that the ransom was brought from paradise by an angel, an idea which has a traditional Muslim parallel as will be shown below. See his: *The Koran Translated*, London, 1915, 83, n. (1).

⁷) J. Schact, *Origins* . . . , London 1950.

⁸) The phrases usually applied are: "*li-qawlihi*(š) . . .", "*wa-l-ḥujjatu fīhi anna al-rasūla* (š) *qāl*: . . .", "*wa-li-anna al-nabiyya* (š) *qāl* . . .", "*ṣahḥa 'an al-rasūli* (š) *qawluhu* . . .", or simply, "*wa-ruwiya 'an al-rasūl* . . .". Compare: Qummī, *Tafsīr*, Najaf 1387 H., 2/226; 'Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415 H.), *Tanzih al-Quran*, Beirut, n. d.,

that those who did so held such view or that all who held it bothered to cite this tradition; a fact which possibly corresponds to the question raised by some concerning its authenticity.⁹⁾ However, the idea of implying that the *dhabih* was Ismā'il was sought also in an interesting parallel, if actually not a variant of the same prophetic tradition with a clear Umayyad ring to its *isnād* through: Ismā'il b. 'Ubayd b. Abī Karima (an Umayyad *mawla*, d. 240 H.) → 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Rahīm al-Khaṭṭābī (unknown) → 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad al-'Utbi (a descendant of 'Utba b. Abī Sufyān) → 'Abdullāh b. Sa'id al-Ṣunābiḥī (sometimes reported as Ṣunayijī or Ṣabbāḥī).¹⁰⁾ Al-Ṣunābiḥī, we are told, happened to attend a debate on the question of *dhabih* in the presence of Mu'āwiya who boasted being an expert on the matter ('*alā l-khabiri saqattum*) and proceeded to tell how he witnessed the Prophet smiling when called "O' son of the two sacrifices" (*ya-bna al-dhabihayn*).

Few scholars, like Ibn Kathīr, Sibṭ and Suyūṭī, reject this tradition on the ground that its *isnād* is weak (*da'if*) or troubled (*fīhi idtirāb*); and Zurqānī in particular simply notes that it is Mu'āwiya's words reported by Ṣunābiḥī, rather than the Prophet's. However, the idea implied in it, as in the previous one, is that the two sacrifices referred to were Muḥammad's father, 'Abdullāh and his ancestor, Ismā'il.¹¹⁾ And in this context some of the sources who bring either of them relate the story of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's vow to sacrifice one of his sons and how the choice fell on 'Abdullāh who was ransomed by one hundred camels.

355; Zamakhshari (d. 528 H.) *Kashshāf*, Cairo 1354 H., 3/308; Zurqānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāhib* Cairo 1326 H., 1/97; Ibn Juzayy *al-Tashīl*, Beirut 1973, 3/174; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, Cairo 1324 H., 7/149; Ṭabarsī *Majma'*, Beirut 1955, 23/74; Nasafī, *Madārik*, Beirut n.d., 4/26; al-Ḥākim (d. 405 H.), *Mustadrak*, Riyāḍ 1968, 2/559; Bayḍāwī, *Anwār*, Cairo 1355 H., 2/143; Diyārbakrī *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*, Cairo 1283, 1/96; al-'Imādi, *Tafsīr*, in the margin of Rāzī, 7/546-7; Abū Ḥayyān, *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*, Cairo 1328, 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīkh*, Beirut 1956, 2/68; al-Kisā'i, *The Tales of the Prophets*, Boston 1978, 162.

⁹⁾ Zurqānī quotes both Zayla'i and Ibn Ḥajar as saying that it is "strange" (*gharīb*). Ibid. See also al-Albānī, *al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍa'ifa*, Beirut 1392 H., 1/337-44.

¹⁰⁾ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, Beirut 1967, 1/264; Suyūṭī, *Durr*, Cairo 1314 H., 5/281; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, Cairo 1952, 4/18; *idem*, *Bidāya*, Cairo 1932, 1/160; Zurqānī 1/97; al-Ḥākim 2/554; Tha'labī, *Qaṣaṣ-'Arā'is*, Cairo 1929, 61; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, Beirut 1985, 1/298-9; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, Beirut 1965, 1/108. Compare also with Shams al-Dīn, *Ithāf al-Akhiṣṣā*, Cairo 1984, 2/87.

¹¹⁾ Except for Muḡhulṭāy who is quoted by Zurqānī, in 1/98, as saying that the second father implied here is Hābil, son of Ādam.

In itself the story of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's vow is well-known from several sources who bring a variety of traditional authorities on it.¹²⁾ However, a cross-examination of this material strikingly reveals that nowhere was the phrase "*ibnu al-dhabihayn*" brought in this context. We shall see, on the other hand, that almost each and every one of the compilers and authorities on this story was reported to have at least one opinion concerning the *dhabih*. Suffice to note at this stage that *ḥadīth* interference into the interpretation of Quran 37/107 as referring to Imā'il could rely only on a pro-Umayyad line which did not succeed to acquire the status of a prophetic tradition and was not supported by any major *sīra*, historiographical or *ḥadīth* work.

2.2. Prophetic *ḥadīths* are brought in support of the pro-Ishāq view too. The simplest form of them is the saying "*al-dhabih ishāq*" or "*ishāq dhabih allāh*" attributed to the Prophet through the companions 'Abbās¹³⁾, Ibn Mas'ūd¹⁴⁾, Abū Hyrayra¹⁵⁾ and Nahār al-'Abdi¹⁶⁾. Few sources bring such sayings in three different narrative contexts often adding the names of other companions through whom they were attributed to the Prophet. According to one, attributed through 'Abbās, Abū Sa'id al-Khudri and 'Ubayd b. 'Umayr, God rejected Dawūd's/Moses' request to equate him with the Patriarchs and specified the merit of each of them. On Ishāq it was said: "He was generous with his own self/was tried with slaughter" (*Jāda lī binafsih/ibtuliya . . . bi-l-dhabh*).¹⁷⁾

¹²⁾ E. g. the tradition of Salama (d. 191 H.) → Ibn Ishāq (d. 150 H.) as reported in both Ibn Hishām, *Sīra* Beirut 1975, 1/140–3 and Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/240–3. Azraqī, though without citing Salama, brings a similar tradition which Ibn Ishāq attributes to 'Alī in a *maqṭū'* form. See his *Akhbār Makka*, Göttingen 1275 H., 286–8. For a second tradition via the line: Zuhri (d. 124 H.) → Qabiṣa b. Dhu'ayb (d. 86–96 H.) → Ibn 'Abbās, compare: Ṭabarī 2/239, Azraqī 282–3 and Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, Beirut 1960, 1/88–9. See also Fākihi who brings a similar tradition of Ibn 'Abbās but via 'Ikrima. *Tārīkh Makka*, Ms. Leiden, Or. 463, fol. 338 (a).

¹³⁾ Ṭabarī 1/263, Tha'labī 61; Ibn al-Athīr a/108; Ālūsī, *Rūḥ al-Ma'āni* Cairo 1345, 23/123; Zurqānī 1/97 quoting Ibn Mardawayh and Bazzār.

¹⁴⁾ Dāraqutnī's *Afrād* and Daylamī's *Musnad al-Firdaws*, quoted in Ālūsī 23/123, Suyūṭī 5/281 and Zurqānī 1/97.

¹⁵⁾ Ibn Mardawayh, Ibn Abī Ḥātim and Bazzār, cf. Zurqānī, *ibid*.

¹⁶⁾ Ibn al-Athīr, *Uṣd*, Cairo 1980, 5/43, noted by Goldziher but in reference to Quran 12/6.

¹⁷⁾ 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Tafsīr*, Ms. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, *tafsīr*/242, 245–6; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/266 and *Tafsīr* 23/52; Tha'labī 60; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; al-Ḥākim 2/556; Sibṭī 1/300–1; Ibn al-Athīr 1/110; Ālūsī 23/123; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Zad al-Masīr*, Beirut 1965,

A second narrative context was attributed to the Prophet through Abū Hurayra with one version of it brought in a *maqṭū'* form via Wahb b. Munabbih. It roughly says that when God relieved Ishāq from the grief of slaughter He granted him a wish which He promised to fulfill.¹⁸⁾ And the third traditional context relates through Ibn Mas'ūd and Nahār al-'Abdī how the Prophet when asked who was the most honourable of all people said: "he is Yūsuf, son of Ya'qūb . . . son of Ishāq, *dhabīh al-lāh*, son of Ibrāhīm . . .".¹⁹⁾

Parallel to each of these traditions there is a *mawqūf* one, i. e. ending with 'Abbās, Abū Hurayra, Ibn Mas'ūd, etc., without being stretched back to the Prophet. Now, comparing the *isnād* chains of the two parallel forms as given by Tabarī raises few interesting issues. 'Abbās's tradition acquires a *marfū'* form only through the chain Ḥasan b. Dinār → 'Alī b. Zayd b. Jud'ān (Baṣran, d. 129–31), while the *mawqūf* form is affected by inserting, instead, the chain: Yaḥyā b. Yamān → (Kūfan, d. 188–9 H.) → Mubārak b. Fuḍāla (Baṣran, d. 165–6 H.).

Needless to say that few late Muslim scholars split over the issue of preference between the two forms on the ground of their preference between these two chains of authorities.²⁰⁾ More important probably is the fact that 'Abbās himself was considered by most commentators as holding a pro-Ishāq view.²¹⁾ The conclusion one is inclined to reach is that Ḥasan b. Dinār and 'Alī b. Zayd were probably responsible for stretching 'Abbās's view back to the Prophet. One also notices that in two variant lines drawn

7/72–3; Zurqānī 1/97; Suyūṭī 5/281 quoting Daylamī, Bazzār, Ibn Abī Ḥātim and Ibn Mardawayh.

¹⁸⁾ Ibn Kathīr 4/16, Suyūṭī 5/282, Ālūsī 23/134 and Zurqānī 1/97, quoting the *Tafsīr* of Ibn Abī Ḥātim and Ṭabarānī's *Awsaf*. For the tradition through Wahb see al-Ḥākim 2/599–60 but compare also with Ibn Qutayba, *Uyūn al-Akhhbār*, Cairo 1963, 2/275–6, where it is brought as a *mawqūf* one.

¹⁹⁾ Ṭabarānī (d. 360 H.), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, Baghdad 1980, 10/183–4; Ibn al-Muẓaffar al-Bazzāz (wrote in 378 H.) *Gharā'ib Ḥadīth Shu'ba*, Ms. Zāhiriyya, *ḥadīth* 124/138; and Ibn Mardawayh as quoted by Suyūṭī 5/282.

²⁰⁾ Ḥākim 2/556; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Ibn al-Athīr, 1/108; Ālūsī 23/123. Zurqānī, 1/97, brings Dhahabī's view and adds Suyūṭī's note that only Bazzār reported Mubārak's tradition in a *marfū'* form. As for the *mawqūf* one he says: "*wa-hwa al-ṣaḥīḥ 'indanā*", probably echoing Ibn Kathīr's view. For other *isnād* variants see Sibṭ 1/300 who quotes his grandfather's, Ibn al-Jawzī's *Tabṣira*.

²¹⁾ Besides the commentaries of Ṭabarī, Ibn Kathīr, Suyūṭī and Ālūsī, cited above, see also: Naḥḥās (d. 338 H.), *I'rāb al-Qurān*, Cairo 1985, 3/431; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Ibn al-Jawzī, 7/72–3; Rāzī 7/150; Nasafī 4/26; Abū Ḥayyān 7/731; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Khāzin (d. 725 H.), *Lubāb al-Ta'wīl*, Cairo 1357, 5/242; Qurṭubī *al-Jāmi'*, Cairo n.d., 7/5543.

for the Yaḥyā → Mubarak tradition the name of Anas b. Mālik was either inserted before 'Abbās or substituted him altogether; a fact which probably explains why Anas too was mentioned by few sources as holding a pro-Ishāq view himself.²²⁾

Examining the tradition Abū Hyrayra → the Prophet is even more illuminating since every chain in its *isnād* was independently named as holding the same pro-Ishāq view. These are: . . . 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd b. Aslam (Medinese, d. 182) → his father, Zayd (d. 136 H.) → 'Aṭā' b. Yasār (d. 103 in Alexandria but was known for being a Medinese *qāṣṣ*) → Abū Hurayra.²³⁾ On the other hand, the names of both Abū Hurayra and 'Aṭā' occur in traditions which state the opposite, pro-Ismā'il view.²⁴⁾ This leaves us with only Zayd b. Aslam and his son as the two chains who not only held a pro-Ishāq view but were also responsible for stretching the *isnād* backwards.

Applying the same method to the tradition Ibn Mas'ūd → the Prophet gives basically the same picture. First, there is a *mawqūf* form transmitted from Ibn Mas'ūd by Abū al-Aḥwaṣ ('Awf b. Mālik, a kufan *qāṣṣ*, d. ca. 80 H.) and another, *marfū'* one, transmitted from him by his son 'Āmir (Abū 'Ubayda, d. 81-2 H.) – the other, later, chains being the same.²⁵⁾ Second, Ibn Mas'ūd himself is named by most of the sources I consulted as holding a pro-Ishāq view.²⁶⁾ Third, some scholars forwarded the *mawqūf* form as a

²²⁾ Tha'labī 60; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72; Sibṭ 1/300.

²³⁾ Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Ālūsī 23/123; al-Ḥākim 2/559; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72-3; Baghawī (d. 516 H.), *Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl*, in the margin of Khāzin, 6/22; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Zurqānī 1/97; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Suyūṭī 5/284 quoting the two third century traditionists Sa'īd b. Manṣūr (d. 226-9 H.) and Ibn al-Mundhir (d. 235-6 H.). Only in Tha'labī, 60, a different line leading to Abū Hurayra was brought as follows: 'Alī b. Ḥijr → 'Umar b. Ḥafṣ → Abān . . .

²⁴⁾ The poet Firazdaq is said by few sources to have attributed such view to Abū Hurayra. As for 'Aṭā', we shall see that he appears in *isnāds* leading to both 'Abdullāh b. Salām and Khawwāt b. Jubayr and stating the same view. See: Suyūṭī's *Durr* 5/281 and *al-Qawl al-Faṣīḥ*, cf. Ālūsī 23/121 and compare with Naḥḥās 3/431 and Qurṭubī 7/5544.

²⁵⁾ Compare: 'Abd al-Razzāq, 245; Suyūṭī 5/282; Ṭabarsī, *Tārīkh* 1/264 and *Tafsīr* 23/52; Tha'labī 60. Naḥḥās, in 3/431, uniquely gives the name of Abū Wā'il instead of Abū al-Aḥwaṣ. Note also that Sibṭ, in 1/300, quotes Tha'labī for a very similar tradition of Ibn Mas'ūd albeit missing the phrase "*dhabīhu l-lāh*".

²⁶⁾ Diyārbakrī 1/95; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Nasafī 5/26; Ibn Juzayy 3/147; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Ālūsī 23/124; Khāzin 5/242; Baghawī 6/22; Ṭūsī (d. 460 H.), *al-Tibyān*, Najaf 1963, 8/518; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72-3; Rāzī 7/150; Naysābūrī, *Gharā'ib*,

*ṣahīḥ*²⁷) while others explicitly discredited the *marfū'* one on the ground that Abū 'Ubayda was only seven when his father died and could not have transmitted from him.²⁸)

Certain variants of this tradition were brought by few scholars who, however, attribute them to companions other than Ibn Mas'ūd and drop Ishāq's title "*dhabīhu l-lāh*".²⁹) However, as to the basic question who was responsible for stretching the Abū 'Ubayda tradition to the Prophet we decide to postpone our judgment until a later stage of this study because of the existence in its *isnad* of the chain: Shu'ba (a Baṣran *mawlā* of the Azd, d. 160 H.) → Abū Ishāq al-Subay'ī (Kūfan, d. 129–32 H.) whose names were brought as authorities on other traditions.

2.3. Companions other than those mentioned above were casually, and without *isnād* or sufficient details, stated by few sources to have each held one of the two conflicting views.³⁰) Among those on whom some traditional information was provided, 'Alī was heavily associated with the pro-Ishāq

in the margin of Ṭabarī's *Tafsīr*, 23/68; Jaṣṣāṣ (d. 370 H.), *Ahkām al-Qur'ān*, Cairo 1347 H., 3/465; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109.

²⁷) Nahḥās 3/431; al-Ḥākim 2/559; Suyūṭī 5/282; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Ibn Kathīr 4/17.

²⁸) See Zurqānī 1/97 and the editor's note in the margin of Ṭabarānī, 10/183–4.

²⁹) Bukhārī, *Ṣahīḥ* Beirut 1981, 4/110–20, 123, 153, 161; Muslim, *Ṣahīḥ*, Cairo 1327 H., 7/103; Nahḥās 3/431; Qāḍī 'Iyād (wrote in 535 H.), *al-Shifā*, Istanbul 1293 H., 1/108, Nawawī (d. 676 H.), *Tahdhīb al-Asmā'*, Cairo n.d. 1/116. The two companions to whom these variants are attributed here are Abū Hurayra and Ibn 'Umar. Note, however that the Ibn Mas'ūd variant was brought with full *isnād* by the two well known *ḥadīth* compilers from the fourth century Ṭabarānī and Bazzāz, the latter as quoted by Suyūṭī.

³⁰) In such manner Abū Bakr was said to have held a pro-Ishāq view by Nasafī 4/26 and Naysābūrī 23/67. Al-Ḥākim 2/559 and Sibṭ 1/298 attributed a pro-Isma'īl view to 'Uthmān, Ubayy b. Ka'b, Anas, 'Abdullāh b. Salām and 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr. Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3 is the only source who attributes the same to Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī. The name of 'Umar is heavily connected with the pro-Isma'īl view but with a complete lack of details. See on him: Diyārbakrī 1/95; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Nahrawālī, *al-F'lām*, Guttingen 1274 H., 37; Ālūsī 23/123; Rāzī 7/150; Khāzin 5/242; Baghawī 6/22; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Tha'labī 60; Zurqānī 1/97; Sibṭ 1/298; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109. On Ibn 'Umar's heavy association with the same view more will be said below. Note, however, that the opposite, pro-Ishāq view, was also attributed to him, albeit without details, by Nahḥās, al-Ḥākim and Zurqānī.

view.³¹⁾ Actually only three sources attribute to 'Alī the opposite view;³²⁾ an idea which, as will be noted below, possibly echoes a confusion concerning the origin of a statement on the ransom being a billy goat which descended from Mount Thabir. As for the *isnād* of 'Alī's pro-Ishāq view it was brought by 'Abd al-Razzāq and includes the chain: Qāsim b. Abī Bazza (Meccan d. 114–24 H.) → Abū al-Ṭufayl ('Āmir b. Wāthila, d. 100–19 H.). From 'Abd al-Razzāq and several later sources we learn that Qāsim himself was heavily associated with the same view and even ended a *mawqūf* line conveying it.³³⁾ On the other hand, Abū al-Ṭufayl is heavily associated with the opposite, pro-Ismā'il view, and appears as such in an *isnād* leading to Ibn 'Abbās;³⁴⁾ a fact which raises the possibility that Qāsim was the one responsible for stretching the pro-Ishāq view through him to 'Alī.

Not much can be elaborated on the traditional information that Jābir b. 'Abdullāh also held a pro-Ishāq view except for the fact that the authority named by all the available sources on such information is Abū al-Zubayr (Muḥammad b. Muslim, Meccan, d. 129 H.).³⁵⁾ But the *isnād* leading to two other companions, 'Abdullāh b. Salām and Khawwāt b. Jubayr who, we are told, held a pro-Ismā'il view, is very interesting because such view was transmitted through 'Aṭa, b. Yasār on the authority of two mid-second century figures: Hilāl b. Usāma and Abū Mālik (descendant of Mālik al-Dār, a *mawlā* of 'Uthmān).³⁶⁾ Now, if one recalls how Zayd b. Aslam was responsible for stretching the pro-Ishaq view back to the 'Aṭā' → Abū Hurayra link mentioned above, one can easily assume that at about the same time Hilāl and Abū Mālik laboured to circulate the pro-Ismā'il view and attribute it to

³¹⁾ 'Abd al-Razzāq, 244; Sa'īd b. Manṣūr and Ibn al-Mundhir, cf. Suyūṭī 5/282; Naḥḥās 4/431; Jaṣṣās 3/465; Baghawī 6/22; Ṭūsi 8/518; Tha'labī 60; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Ṭabarsī 7/23; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Sibṭ 1/298; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Nasafī 4/26; Rāzī 7/150; Naysābūrī 23/68; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Juzayy 3/174; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Ālūsī 23/123; Zurqānī 1/97; Nahrawālī 37; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109; al-Muttaqī al-Hindī *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, Haydarabad 1950, 2/309.

³²⁾ Ālūsī 23/121 quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl*; Qurṭubī 7/5551, al-Muttaqī al-Hindī, *ibid*.

³³⁾ 'Abd al-Razzāq, 245, with the line: Ma'mar → Ḥakam b. Abān → Qāsim b. Abī Bazza. Compare also with: Qurṭubī 7/5543, Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3, Ibn Kathīr 4/17, and Sibṭ 1/298 where the name is Q. b. Abī Barza, as against Tha'labī 60 and Zurqānī 1/97 where it is Q. b. Abī Bara.

³⁴⁾ Tha'labī 60; Qurṭubī 7/5544; Ālūsī 23/121, quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl*.

³⁵⁾ Naḥḥās 3/431; Ḥākīm 2/559; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Suyūṭī 5/282; Zurqānī 1/97.

³⁶⁾ Ḥākīm 2/556; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72; Khāzin 5/242; Suyūṭī 5/281–2.

'Aṭā' → Ibn Salam/Khawwat. The latter's tradition is especially noteworthy since after describing in narrative details Abraham's sacrifice of the ransom *wa'īl* (antelope), it concludes with the statement that this was done in Minā "where beasts are (ritually) slaughtered today" (*fī manḥar al-budun al-yawm*).

The last companion to be considered here is Ibn 'Umar who is heavily associated with the pro-Ismā'il view.³⁷⁾ A quick glance at the *isnād*, brought by few sources, however, soon reveals that such tradition was transmitted through Isrā'il (b. Yūnus, Kūfan, d. 161–2 H.) → Thuwayr b. Abi Fākhita (Abū al-Jahm, a *rāfiqī* Kūfan) → Mujāhid b. Jabr (Meccan, d. 101–2 H.). We shall soon see that Mujāhid himself was often associated with the same view and also played an important link in the traditions of Ibn 'Abbās conveying it; a fact which in the case under discussion suffices to cut short at least the chain of Ibn 'Umar.

3. Ibn 'Abbās, his "Students" and Others

As expected by now, the name of Ibn 'Abbās was often associated with both views, sometimes even without *isnād*.³⁸⁾ From the sources which provide such *isnād* we learn that the pro-Ismā'il view was reported from him by Mujāhid, 'Aṭā' b. Abi Rabāḥ (Meccan, d. 114–7 H.), Yūsuf b. Māhak/Mihrān (a Persian *mawlā* of Quraysh, considered Meccan, d. 103–14 H.), Sha'bi (Kūfan, d. 103–10), Abū al-Jawzā' (Aws b. 'Abdullāh, Baṣran Azdi, d. 83). On the other hand, his pro-Ishāq view was often reported through 'Ikrima (Medinese, d. 104–10 H.) and less so through Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāḥim (al-Khurāsānī, d. 102–6), al-Qāsīm (poss. b. Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr, d. 101–2), Abū Ṣāliḥ (Bādhām, d. 101 H.) and Murra al-Hamdānī (Kūfan, d.

³⁷⁾ Ṭabari 1/267; Ḥākim 2/554; Ibn Kathir 4/17; Naḥḥās 3/431; Jaṣṣās 3/465; Bahgawī 6/22; Tha'labi 60; Ṭūsi 8/517; Suyūṭi 5/281 quoting Ibn Ḥumayd and Ibn al-Mundhir; Zamakhshari 3/308; Ṭabarsi 23/74; Ibn al-Jawzi 7/72; Rāzi 7/149; Qurṭūbi 7/5544; Nasafi 4/26; Ibn Juzayy 3/174; Naysābūri 23/67; Ālūsī 23/121 quoting Suyūṭi's *al-Qawl*; Diyārbakri 1/95; Nahrwāli 37; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371.

³⁸⁾ 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Jaṣṣās 3/465; Ṭūsi 8/517; Zamakhshari 3/308; Nasafi 4/26; Qurṭūbi 7/5544, 5551; Ṭabarsi 23/74; Rāzi 7/149; Ibn Juzayy 3/174; Naysābūri 23/67; 'Imādī 7/547; Suyūṭi 5/284, quoting Ibn Ḥumayd; Nahrwāli, 38–9, quoting Fākihi, Abū Ḥayyān 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68. Compare also with the pseudo-Ibn 'Abbās work, *Tanwīr al-Miqbās* in the margin of Suyūṭi, 4/343; Ālūsī 23/121; Khāzin 5/242–3; Diyārbakri 1/95, Zurqānī 1/95.

76–82 H.). Moreover, Sa'īd b. Jubayr (d. 95 H.) and Abū al-Ṭufayl were equally mentioned as reporting the two opposite views from him; an issue which deserves a special treatment.

3.1. On Mujāhid's transmission from Ibn 'Abbās we do not always have sufficient information.³⁹). From Ṭabarī and al-Ḥākim we learn, however, that the pro-Ismā'il view was transmitted via him on the authority of both Ibn Abī Najīḥ (Meccan, d. 131–2 H.) and Layth (b. Abī Sulaym, either a Meccan *mawlā* of Quraysh or a Kūfan, d. 143–8 H.).⁴⁰) Now, in the relatively early works of Thawrī (d. 161 H.), 'Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211 H.) and Ṭabarī (d. 310 H.), the chain which passes through Ibn Abī Najīḥ ends with Mujāhid himself, i. e. without being stretched to Ibn 'Abbās,⁴¹) a fact which is echoed by several later sources which present Mujāhid himself as holding a pro-Imsā'il view.⁴²) However, the name of Mujāhid is sometimes mentioned, albeit without *isnād*, in association with the pro-Ishāq view in a style which disguises a mid-second century narrative touch.⁴³) While this suggests that Ibn Abī Najīḥ is responsible for projecting his own pro-Ismā'il view back to Mujāhid, could he be also responsible for adding the name of Ibn 'Abbās to the line too? Comparing the *isnāds* occurring in Thawrī, 'Abd al-Razzāq and Ṭabarī gives a clear answer: the name of Ibn 'Abbās appears in the tradition Ibn Abī Najīḥ → Mujāhid though not as transmitted by Thawrī but rather by Shibl b. 'Abbād (Meccan, d. 148–50 H.), who most probably did it. As for the question whether to understand from this that either Thawrī did not know that Mujāhid's source was Ibn 'Abbās or that the latter was not as yet established as a higher authority to be sought for, our information is not conclusive. For, the fact of the matter is that Thawrī is quoted in sources other than his *Tafsīr* as one of several mid-second century reporters of the opposite pro-Ishāq view of Ibn 'Abbās, though not through Mujāhid but, as we shall soon see, through 'Ikrima and Sa'īd b. Jubayr.

³⁹) For the abridged link "Mujāhid → Ibn 'Abbās" see: Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Ibn al-Athīr 1/100, Suyūṭī 5/280–1.

⁴⁰) Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/268; al-Ḥākim 2/430–1.

⁴¹) Sufyān al-Thawrī, *Tafsīr*, Rampur 1965, 213; 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/269. See also Ibn Kathīr 4/18.

⁴²) Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3, Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzī 7/149; Qurtubī 7/5544; Khāzin 5/242; Naysābūri 23/67; Suyūṭī 5/281–5 quoting Ibn Ḥumayd; Ālūsī 23/121, quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl*; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Nahrawālī 37; Abu Ḥayyān 7/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68.

⁴³) Naḥḥās, *Irāb* 3/341; *idem*, *al-Nāsikh wa-l-Mansūkh* 211; Qurtubī 7/5543; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Suyūṭī 5/283; Zurqānī 1/97; Ālūsī 23/123.

3.2. The traditional link Ibn Jubayr → Ibn 'Abbās was associated with the two opposite views. However, this does not seem to be the problem of Ibn Jubayr⁴⁴) or his transmittor, 'Aṭā' b. al-Sā'ib, but rather with the generation of scholars who took from the latter: Muḥammad b. Maymūn al-Sukkarī (from Marw, d. 166–8 H.) for the pro-Ismā'il view, and Ḥammād b. Salama (Baṣran *mawlā* of Tamīm or Quraysh, d. 167 H.) for the pro-Ishāq view.⁴⁵) The Hammad → 'Aṭā' tradition is especially interesting because it is almost identical to one which he transmits from Abū 'Āṣim al-Ghanawī (almost unknown) → Abū al-Ṭufayl → Ibn 'Abbās.⁴⁶) Both traditions describe in minute narrative detail the act of sacrifice in Mecca which include clear *hajj* rituals (*manāsik*) there, e. g.: the devil's attempt to lure Ibrāhīm, his stoning by the latter, etc. The main difference, however, is that al-Ghanawī's tradition states that the *dhabih* was Ismā'il adding few more Muslim elements of *hajj* rituals to the picture such as Ibrāhīm's racing with the devil at the *mas'ā*, Ismā'il's suggestion to be rapped with his only shirt as *kafan* and the ransom ram being the standard Muslim "white, prime, horned" one (*abyaḍ, a'yan, aqran*).

This Ḥammād → Ghanawī version enjoyed a wide circulation from the third century on and helped to establish the connection of both Abū al-Ṭufayl and Ibn 'Abbās with the pro-Ismā'il view.⁴⁷) However, the problem does not seem to lie with the *tābi'* Abū al-Ṭufayl from whom al-Qāsim b. Abī Bazza has transmitted 'Alī's pro-Ishāq view noted above. We have also seen how al-Qāsim himself was identified as holding a pro-Ishāq view, i. e. as independent from the Abū al-Ṭufayl → 'Alī link.

Coming back to the problem of associating the link Ibn Jubayr → Ibn 'Abbās with the pro-Ishāq view, one notices that 'Aṭā' was not the only one responsible for forwarding it. The other figure who played such a role was 'Abdullāh b. 'Uthmān b. Khuthaym (a Meccan *qāri'*, ally to Banū Zuhra, d. 132–44) as reported by Ḥammād himself and other mid-second century

⁴⁴) Indeed the two contradictory views were attributed to him. See: Naḥḥās 3/431; Tha'labī 60; Ibn al-Jawzi 2/72–3; Rāzi 7/150; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68.

⁴⁵) Compare: Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, Cairo 1313 H. 1/306–7; Ṭabarānī 11/456; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/267–8; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Suyūṭī 5/281; Ibn al-Jawzi 7/72–3; Ālūsī 23/121.

⁴⁶) Ibn Ḥanbal, *ibid*; Ṭabarānī, *ibid*; Muttaqī al-Hindī 5/41–2.

⁴⁷) Beside the sources of Ibn Ḥanbal, Ṭabarānī and Ṭabarī cited above, we meet, through Suyūṭī, other *ḥadīth* compilers like Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ibn Mardawayh and Bayḥaqī. Ibn Kathīr says in 4/15 that "Hishām (?) brought this tradition at length in his *Manāsik*". See also: Qāsimī, *Mahāsīn al-Ta'wil*, Cairo 1959, 14/5052.

figures like Thawrī, Ibn Jurayj (d. 150 H.) and Dawūd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-'Aṭṭār (Meccan, d. 174–5 H.)⁴⁸). There is also room to believe that figures less known than Ibn Khuthaym transmitted something similar from Ibn Jubayr.⁴⁹) However, it was Ibn Khuthaym's tradition which enjoyed the widest circulation from the second half of the second century on.⁵⁰) The reason for such popularity lies, in my opinion, in the fact that it incorporated the pro-Ishāq element within Mecca's *hajj* rituals in a more successful way than even the Ḥammād → 'Aṭā' one could do. It states, for example, that the site of sacrifice was a rock at the base of Mount Thabīr, the white/greyish, prime, horned ransom ram was the same one sacrificed by Adam's son and has, since, been stored in paradise, etc. We can see how, under the impact of this tradition, the name of Ibn Jubayr was connected in few sources with more attempts to reconcile the Biblical heritage with Mecca. We learn, for example, that Ibrāhīm, while dwelling in Syria, saw in his dream that he should sacrifice Ishāq, that valleys and mountains were folded for him so that he could make the journey of a whole month in one morning (*fī ghadwa wāhida*) to the sacrifice place in Minā, etc.⁵¹)

3.3. 'Ikrima is another major figure through whom the pro-Ishāq view was attributed to Ibn 'Abbās. Though few sources do not give detailed *isnād* to this link,⁵²) the main authority on it seems to be Dawūd b. Abī Hind (Poss. a Baṣran, d. 139–44 H.) as reported by people like Ibn Idris (poss. Shafī'i), Ibn 'Ulayya (Ismā'il b. Ibrāhīm b. Miqsam, Baṣran, d. 194 H.), Mu'tamir b. Sulaymān (Baṣran, d. 187 H.), Thawrī and Ḥammād b. Salama.⁵³) At the same time, 'Ikrima himself is overwhelmingly stated as holding such view, albeit usually without *isnād*.⁵⁴) Moreover, the same view was attributed to

⁴⁸) Compare: Azraqī 401 Nahḥās, *Ḥ'rab* 3/431; Ḥākim 2/558; Ibn Kathīr 4/16; Qurṭubī 7/5543, 5550.

⁴⁹) E. g. the line brought by Fākihī, 515 (a): → Muḥammad b. 'Alī → Abū Bakr → Khālid b. Muḥammad → Muḥammad b. Thābit → Musa [b. Sa'd] *mawlā* of Abū Bakr → Ibn Jubayr.

⁵⁰) It is probably worth noting that Wāqidi was one of the people who reported it from al-'Aṭṭār. Cf. al-Ḥākim 2/558. From Suyūṭī 5/284 we learn that Ibn Ḥumayd, Ibn al-Mundhir and Ibn Abi Ḥātim brought it too.

⁵¹) Baghawī 6/22; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Sibṭ 1/300; Zurqānī 1/98; Diyārbakrī 1/95.

⁵²) E. g., Baghawī, *ibid*; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109; Suyūṭī 5/282, quoting Faryābī, Sa'id b. Maṣūr and Ibn Ḥumayd for it.

⁵³) Ṭabarī *Tārīkh* 1/264 and *Tafsīr* 23/51; Nahḥās 3/431; Ḥākim 2/558; Ibn Kathīr 4/19.

⁵⁴) Baghawī 6/22; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzī 7/150; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Ṭabarī 23/48; Ālūsī 23/123; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Suyūṭī 5/

him by Abū Ishāq al-Subay'ī too in a tradition which is usually the only one brought by commentators on Quran 12/6.⁵⁵)

This apparent unanimity concerning 'Ikrima's view, or its attribution through him to Ibn 'Abbās, makes it "too plain" and, hence paradoxically, useless for the purpose of modern enquiry. However, nothing can be absolutely unanimous in Muslim tradition as we vaguely read in few sources that the pro-Ismā'il view was "one of two traditions" reported from him.⁵⁶) But, all the same, since no sufficient traditional details are provided, one cannot carry such enquiry any further.

The information on two other figures, Murra al-Hamdānī (Kūfan, d. 76 H.) and Abū Šāliḥ (Bādhām, d. 101 H.), as having reported a pro-Ishāq view from Ibn 'Abbās, is insufficient too. It occurs in a syntactically clumsy statement brought only by Ṭabarī and says that when Ibrāhīm received the good news that Ishāq would be born, he vowed to sacrifice him.⁵⁷) As we shall see, however, such notion is heavily associated with the name of another early second century figure, Suddī (Kūfan, d. 127 H.) while Abū Šāliḥ was mentioned by other sources as holding a pro-Ismā'il view.⁵⁸)

Ḍahḥāk b. Muzāḥim (Khurāsānī, d. 102–6 H.) was mentioned on the authority of Juwaybir (b. Sa'īd al-Balkhī, d. 140–50 H.) as reporting the pro-Ishāq view from Ibn 'Abbās. However, such tradition belongs to the *bad'* and *qaṣaṣ* genre and was not brought by any commentator that I know in the context of interpreting Quran 37/107. It only says that al-Khiḍr's mother used to supplicate by turning to "the God of . . . Ishaq *dhabih al-lāh* and of Ibrāhīm *khalil al-lāh*."⁵⁹) Ḍahḥāk himself was mentioned by one late source as holding the opposite, pro-Ismā'il view.⁶⁰) But, again, no further enquiry could be conducted since this is done without any traditional details.

Al-Qāsim (poss. b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, d. 101–2 H.) was mentioned on the authority of Zuhri (d. 124 H.) as reporting the pro-Ishāq view from Ibn 'Abbās.⁶¹) However, such information is very meagre as we are

280; Zurqānī 1/97; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371.

⁵⁵) E. g. see Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr* 12/154; Ibn al-Jawzī 4/182; Ṭabarsī 13/13; Qurṭubī 4/3358 and compare with Ibn Kathīr who refrains from mentioning 'Ikrima probably because of his personal preference of the opposite view.

⁵⁶) Ibn al-Jawzī 7/73; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Naysābūrī 23/67.

⁵⁷) *Tārīkh*, 1/272–3.

⁵⁸) Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ibn Kathīr 4/18, quoting Ibn Abi Ḥātim: *Ālūsī* 23/121, quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl . . .*

⁵⁹) 'Umāra b. Wathīma (d. 289 H.), *Bad' al-Khalq*, Wiesbaden 1978, 2.

⁶⁰) Naysābūrī, 23/67.

⁶¹) Suyūṭī 5/279 quoting 'Abd al-Razzāq and Ibn al-Mundhir.

only told, in relation to Quran 37/101, that the child whom Ibrāhīm was promised was Ishāq “and that [his sacrifice] was in Minā.”

Although isolated, having Zuhri in the *isnād* of this tradition could be indicative since he was heavily reported as holding the same view himself⁶²) with only one source attributing the opposite, pro-Ismā‘il one to him.⁶³) From the *bad’* source quoted above we also learn about a tradition of Zuhri on the authority of Ibn Sam‘ān (‘Abdullāh b. Ziyād, Medinese, d. ca. 150 H.). It says that Yūsha‘ b. Nūn supplicated to God when he fought the people of Jericho describing the sons of Israel as “. . . the descendants of Ibrāhīm, your *khalīl* and of Ishāq, your *dhabīh* . . .”⁶⁴)

3.4. Of the group of successors who have reported the pro-Ismā‘il view from Ibn ‘Abbās, note has already been made of Mujāhid. Another figure, Abū al-Jawzā’ (Aws. b. ‘Abdullāh, an Āzdi Baṣran, d. 83 H.) was also mentioned as such, albeit by one isolated source and without sufficient details.⁶⁵) The authority on two others, Yūsuf b. Mihrān/Māhak (a Meccan *mawlā* of Persian origin, d. 103–4) and ‘Ammār b. Abi ‘Ammār (a Meccan *mawlā* of Banū Hāshim, d. ca. 120 H.), was ‘Alī b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān as transmitted by Hushaym b. Bashīr (Wasiṭī, d. 183 H.) and Mubārak b. Fuḍāla.⁶⁶) Needless to say that Yūsuf b. Mihrān stands in some sources as holding this view himself, i. e. without attributing it to Ibn ‘Abbās.⁶⁷) And the same can be said about two other figures, ‘Aṭā’ b. Abi Rabāḥ (Meccan, d. 114–7 H.) and Sha‘bī (Kūfan, d. 103–10 H.)⁶⁸), though the latter was mentioned by few sources as holding the opposite, pro-Ishāq view.⁶⁹)

⁶²) Baghawī 6/22; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzi 7/150; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Tha‘labī 60; Ālūsī 23/123; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Zurqānī 1/97; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68.

⁶³) Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3.

⁶⁴) ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, 52.

⁶⁵) Ibn al-Jawzī, 7/72–3.

⁶⁶) Compare: Ṭabari, *Tārīkh* 1/268; Baghawī 6/22; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn al-Jawzī, *ibid*; Suyūṭī 5/281, quoting Sa‘id b. Maṣūn, Ibn al-Mundhir, Ibn Ḥumayd and Ibn Abi Ḥātim; Diyārbakrī 1/96; Ibn al-Athīr 1/110.

⁶⁷) Tha‘labī 60; Ibn al-Jawzī, *ibid*; Qurṭubī 7/5544; Ibn Kathīr 4/18, Suyūṭī 5/281; Ālūsī 23/121.

⁶⁸) Ṭabari, *Tārīkh* 1/267–9; Tha‘labī, *ibid*; Ibn al-Jawzī, *ibid*; Baghawī 6/22; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Kathīr, *ibid*; Diyārbakrī 1/96; Suyūṭī 5/279–81, quoting Faryābī, Ibn Abi Shayba, Ibn al-Mundhir, Ibn Abi Ḥātim and al-Ḥākim; Ibn al-Athīr 1/110; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ṭūsī 8/517; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzi 1/110; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ṭūsī 8/517; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzi 7/149; Qurṭubī 7/5544; Ālūsī, *ibid*.

⁶⁹) Naḥḥās, *Ḥarab* 3/431; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Zurqānī 1/97; Ālūsī 23/123.

This last occurrence seems strange since, as we shall see later, the testimony reported in the name of Sha'bi that he saw the two horns of the ram hanging in the Ka'ba was heavily used by subsequent commentators as a "proof" that the *dhabih* was Ismā'il. As for 'Aṭā's tradition and the one attributed through him to Ibn 'Abbās, note at this stage that both contain the same nationalist element that "the Jews have lied when alleging that he [i.e. the *dhabih*] was Ishāq".⁷⁰).

Coming back to the *isnād* aspect we notice that the link 'Aṭā' → Ibn 'Abbās was transmitted on the authority of only 'Umar b. Qays (Meccan, d. ca. 150 H.) as reported by 'Abdullāh b. Wahb (Egyptian *mawlā* of Quraysh, d. 197 H.). However, since no traditional details are given on the transmission of the view of 'Aṭā' himself, no further follow-up could be conducted.

As for the link Sha'bi → Ibn 'Abbās and the view of Shu'ba himself we notice that Dawūd b. Abī Hind (Baṣran, d. 139–41 H.) is a major authority on both of them. However, what Khālid b. 'Abdullāh (Wasiṭi, d. 179–82 H.) and 'Abd al-A'lā (Qurashi Baṣran, d. 198 H.) report from him as Sha'bi's own view, Ibn 'Ulayya (d. 193 H.) presents as Ibn 'Abbās's through Sha'bi. While this cannot tell us for sure what was the position of Dawūd or Ibn 'Ulayya, it certainly demonstrates how towards the end of the second century the need to stretch traditions back to Ibn 'Abbās was beginning to make itself felt. Actually the very wording of the report brought by Ṭabari testifies to this: ". . . said Ibn 'Ulayya: Dawūd b. Abi Hind was asked who was the son of Ibrāhīm whom he was ordered to sacrifice? He alleged that Sha'bi said: said Ibn 'Abbās: he was Ismā'il." (. . . *Ibn 'Ulayya, qāl: su'ila Dawūd b. Abī Hind: ayya ibnayy Ibrāhīm umira bi-dhabih? fa-za'ama anna al-Sah'biyya qāl: qāla Ibnu 'Abbās: huwa Ismā'il.*)

4. Other Successors and the Exegets

To few people of the generation of Ibn 'Abbās and his "students" was attributed either, or sometimes even both, of the two contradictory views. Examining the traditional information of such attribution reveals, however, that it was often done by the same second century figures whom we have already met in other chains leading back to the Prophet, Ibn 'Abbās or other companions.

⁷⁰) For attributing this tradition to 'Aṭā' or through him to Ibn 'Abbās, compare: Tha'labi 60; Ṭabari, *Tārikh* 1/268; Suyūṭi 5/280; Ḥākim 2/554–5; Ibn al-Athir 1/110.

4.1. Let us start with Ka'b al-Aḥbār whose name is exclusively associated with the pro-Ishāq view often without *isnād* or details,⁷¹⁾ and sometimes even in a moulded form without specifying his name.⁷²⁾ From the available information we learn that such view of Ka'b was basically presented as a *ḥadīth* of his to Abū Hurayra whom we have already met either as holding such view himself or as attributing it in a *marfū'* form to the Prophet. As for Ka'b's tradition, Zuhri, who seems to be its commonest link, transmitted it from either al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad or a certain descendant of the family of Ḥāritha/Jāriya al-Thaqafi.⁷³⁾

Needless to recall that Zuhri is heavily associated with the pro-Ishāq view and that the chain Zuhri → al-Qāsim was held responsible for attributing it to Ibn 'Abbās. As for Ka'b's tradition it was transmitted from Zuhri on by three different links: Ma'mar (b. Rāshid, Baṣran *mawlā* of the Azd, d. 152-4) → 'Abd al-Razzāq; Yūnus b. Yazīd (al-Ayli, *mawlā* of B. Umayya, d. 159 H.) → Ibn Wahb ('Abdullāh, *mawlā* of Quraysh, d. 197 H.); 'Abdullāh/al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr (Medinese, d. 130-5) → Ibn Ishāq.

This last link, which was reported by both Ibrāhīm b. Mukhtār (al-Rāzī, d. 180 H.) and Salama (b. al-Faḍl al-Rāzī, d. 191 H.), is problematic since everywhere else Ibn Ishāq was quoted for a narrative on Ibrāhīm's journey from al-Shām to Mecca following the order to sacrifice Ismā'il.⁷⁴⁾ Now, the only source which gives an *isnād* to a similar narrative is Ṭabarī who however vaguely states the chain as: Salama → Ibn Ishaq → "some of the people of knowledge" (*ba'd ahl al-'ilm*). We also notice that this version does not mention the name of the *dhabīh* and, as such, is very similar to what Tha'labī specifies as "the tradition of Ka'b and Ibn Ishāq from his authorities".⁷⁵⁾

This is not, then, the above-mentioned tradition of Ka'b through Ibn Ishāq → Ibn Abī Bakr → Zuhri which explicitly states that the *dhabīh* was Ishāq; and the question which addresses itself is: who was Ibn Ishāq's source for the opposite, pro-Ismā'il, view? Actually a clue to solving this

⁷¹⁾ Nahḥās, *Frāb*, 3/431; Jaṣṣāṣ 3/465; Baghawī 6/22; Kisā'i, *Tales of the Prophets*, Boston 1978, 160-1, Tha'labī 60; Ṭūsī 8/518; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72-3; Rāzī 7/150; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242-3; Naysābūrī 23/68; Ālūsī 23/123; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Ibn Kahldūn 2/68; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371.

⁷²⁾ E. g. see Nuwayri (d. 733 H.), *Nihāyat al-Arab*, Cairo 1938, 13/121 and even Tha'labī, 62.

⁷³⁾ Compare: Ṭabarī *Tārīkh* 1/265-6, *Tafsīr* 23/52; 'Abd al-Razzāq 243-7; Ḥākim 2/557-8; Ibn Kathīr 4/15-6; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109-10.

⁷⁴⁾ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/267; Tha'labī 62; Ṭabarsī 23/79; Khāzin 5/244; Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Ibn al-Athīr 1/111-2; Diyārbakrī 1/97.

⁷⁵⁾ Tha'labī, *ibid.*

enigma comes from an unexpected direction; namely, the traditional information on Muḥammad b. Ka'b al-Quraḏī (Medinese, d. 108–20) who is heavily associated with the pro-Ismā'il view, albeit often by sources which reiterate that without *isnād* or details.⁷⁶) From those who bring such information we learn that the one who transmitted this view of al-Quraḏī was none other than Ibn Ishāq as reported by Salama himself and Yūnus b. Bukayr (Kūfan d. 199 H.).⁷⁷)

To end up the discussion, a note on the variant elements of content brought by these traditional formations must be made. Roughly speaking, all the versions of Ka'b's tradition describe in a narrative style how the devil tried in vain to lure Ibrāhīm's family, how the latter took a robe and a knife and proceeded to the mountain and how Ishāq was consent and cooperative, etc. In one version by Ma'mar → Zuhri we are also told that when Ishāq was ransomed, God gave him the accepted wish. Above all, there is the element of specifying al-Shām or even Jerusalem as the place of sacrifice.

We notice on the other hand, that Ibn Ishāq's anonymous tradition opens with the statement that Ibrāhīm used to visit Hājar and Ismā'il on the *burāq* which could get him within one day from al-Shām to Mecca. Then in quite the same narrative style we are told about the devil's attempt to lure Ibrāhīm's family, the latter's stoning of him and proceeding to Mount Thabir, Ismā'il's consent, etc.

Between these two extremes comes the tradition of Ibn Ishāq "from his authorities" which, though reiterating the elements of the devil's luring and the boy's consent, does not specify the latter's name and lacks the element of stoning and the context of *manāsik*.

To the reported role played by al-Quraḏī, who was of ex-Jewish origin, in forwarding the pro-Ismā'il view, a further note will be made below. As for Ibn Ishāq, the least that can be said here is that his reported transmission of two crucially different versions on this issue may explain why such material was not included in any recension of the *bad'* chapters of his *sira*. However, having transmitted something similar to al-Quraḏī's tradition in an era where everything was tuned towards Mecca eventually created the impression that he himself held a pro-Ismā'il view, though the traditionist Ṭabarī was by no means carried away by that impression.

⁷⁶) Jaṣṣāṣ 3/465; Bahgawī 6/22; Ṭūsi 8/517; Ibn al-Jawzi 7/72–3; Sibṭ 1/298; Zamakhshari 3/308; Qurtubi 7/5544; Ṭabarsi 23/74; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Abū Ḥayyān 3/371; Naysābūrī 23/67; Suyūṭī 5/281.

⁷⁷) Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/269; Tha'labī 60; Hākim 2/557–8; Ibn Kathir 4/18.

4.2. With greater or lesser details the pro-Ishāq view was attributed to a group of other successors. One of them is Masrūq b. al-Ajda' (Kūfan, d. 62–3 H.) whose position was reported on the authority of Shu'ba and Zakariyyā b. Abī Zā'ida (Kūfan d. 147–9 H.) from Abū Ishāq al-Subay'i.⁷⁸ One may recall that the link Shu'ba → al-Subay'i was the main one through which the same view was attributed to both Ibn Mas'ūd and, in a *marfu'* form the Prophet himself. We have also seen that al-Subay'i transmitted the same view from 'Irkima concerning Quran 12/6.

The name of al-Subay'i occurs in the *isnād* of a tradition by another Kūfan successor, Abū Maysara ('Amr b. Shuraḥbil, d. 63 H.) where Ishāq was given the epithet "*dhabīḥ al-lāh*". According to this tradition such epithet was given by Yūsuf b. Ya'qūb in a self-identification statement which he made to Fir'awn, King of Egypt. Ḥamza al-Zayyāt (Kūfan, d. 156–8 H.) is the only authority named for it, and, hence he was sometimes inadequately mentioned as reporting it directly from Abū Maysara.⁷⁹ However, one cannot but notice that the same tradition was transmitted almost word for word but through a completely different line ending with the Kūfan link Abū Sinān al-Shaybānī (Dirār b. Murra, d. 132 H.) → 'Abdullāh b. Abī al-Hudhayl (d. 120 H.) and claiming to convey the view of the latter.⁸⁰

The same view as attributed to Makḥūl (d. 112–8) and a certain al-Qāsim b. Zayd (or Yazid) albeit without sufficient details.⁸¹ There is also the early second century Baṣran *qāṣṣ*, 'Uthmān b. Ḥāḍir, concerning whom Suyūṭī quotes the third century traditionist Ibn Ḥumayd. From him we learn about a narrative similar to the Ibn Khuthaym → Ibn Jubayr tradition of Ishāq's sacrifice in Mecca. Ibrāhīm, we are told, left Sārah in the mosque of al-Khayf; the ram which descended from Mount Thabir has grazed in paradise for forty years; God granted Ishāq an accepted wish, etc. . . .⁸²

We have also seen that this last element was attributed to the Prophet in traditions which went back to him through Wahb b. Munabbih (d. 100–6) among other figures. Now, two sources attribute to Wahb himself a pro-

⁷⁸) Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/267; *idem*, *Tafsīr* 23/52. For the same information but without traditional details see: Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzī 7/150; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109; Suyūṭī 5/282; Zurqānī 1/97; Diyārbakrī 1/95.

⁷⁹) Compare Ṭabarī's *Tārīkh* and *Tafsīr*, *ibid*; Tha'labī, *ibid*; Ibn Kathīr, *ibid*; Ālūsī 23/123. In Sibṭ, 1/301, Ibn Ishāq was wrongly stated instead of Abū Ishāq al-Subay'i.

⁸⁰) Ṭabarī, Tha'labī, Ibn Kathīr and Ālūsī, *ibids*; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Zurqānī 1/97.

⁸¹) Ibn Kathīr, Zurqānī and Ālūsī, *ibids*; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68.

⁸²) Suyūṭī 5/283.

Ishāq view in a traditional form which bring a unique narrative element. It was transmitted from Wahb through his grandson Idris b. Sinān by the latter's son 'Abd al-Mun'im. It does not say where the sacrifice took place but uniquely tells how Ibrāhīm's friend, El'azar advised him to obey God's order.⁸³⁾

Contrary to this group, our sources mention few other successors who reportedly held a pro-Ismā'il view. However, very little or no *isnād* or details were given; a fact that makes any further enquiry impossible. Such is the case with 'Alqama (b. Qays? Kūfan, d. 61–3 H.) and 'Abdullāh b. Shaqīq (Baṣran, d. 95–108 H.).⁸⁴⁾ On another, a certain Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim, we learn only from Azraqī in the context of his talk about "the mosque of the ram" (*masjid al-kabsh*) in Mecca. The son of Ḥasan, we are told, transmitted from his father that the *dhabīh* was Ismā'il.⁸⁵⁾ Finally, even on the prominent successor Sa'id b. al-Musayyib (d. 93–100 H.) we know very little details although he was heavily noted for holding such position.⁸⁶⁾

4.3. With another group of early to mid-second century figures we have the usual problem of two opposite views being attributed to each of them. They are: 'Abd al-Rahmān (b. 'Abdullāh) b. Sābiṭ (Meccan, d. 118 H.), Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110 H.), Qatāda (d. 117–8), Suddī (d. 127 H.) Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 114–8 H.) and Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148 H.). Roughly speaking, each of these figures is heavily associated with one view with the existence, on the other hand, of sporadic information to the contrary.

To start with, only Ibn al-Jawzī mentions the name of Ibn Sābiṭ as holding a pro-Ismā'il view and, that, without any *isnād* or details.⁸⁷⁾ On the other hand, he is heavily associated with the pro-Ishāq view through the Kūfan link: Isrā'il (b. Yūnus b. Abī Ishāq al-Subay'i, d. 161–2 H.) → Jābir (al-Ju'fi, d. 127–32 H.).⁸⁸⁾

⁸³⁾ Ibn Qutayba, *Uyūn al-Akhhār*, Cairo 1963, 2/275–6; Ḥākim 2/559–60. Ibn al-Jawzī, 7/72–3, brings something similar but without *isnād* or details.

⁸⁴⁾ Naḥḥās, *Irāb* 3/431; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Zurqānī 1/97; Ālūsī 23/123.

⁸⁵⁾ Azraqī, 401.

⁸⁶⁾ Actually only 'Abd al-Razzāq, 245, quotes a certain Ibn Shayba as saying that Ibn al-Musayyib when asked whether the *dhabīh* was Ishāq vehemently denied it and confirmed that it was Ismā'il. See also: Suyūṭī 5/281, quoting Ibn Humayd; Jaṣṣāṣ 3/465; Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60; Ṭūsi 8/517; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Rāzī 7/149; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Qurṭubī 7/5544; Khāzin 5/242; Naysābūrī 23/67.

⁸⁷⁾ Ibn al-Jawzī, 7/72–3.

⁸⁸⁾ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/267 and *Tafsīr* 23/53. See also Tha'labī 60; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Sibṭī 1/298; Ibn al-Athīr 1/109; Zurqānī 1/97; Ālūsī 23/123.

Few sources attribute to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī a pro-Ishāq view. From the information we have it becomes clear that such attribution originated in the occurrence of his name in the line of 'Alī b. Zayd's tradition, noted above, which leads to 'Abbās or even the Prophet on calling Ishāq *dhabīh* because "he was generous with himself" (*jāda bi-nafsīhi*).⁸⁹) On the other hand, the pro-Ismā'il view was heavily associated with Ḥasan's name, though in several sources this was reiterated without *isnād* and only by bringing a statement of his that "Ismā'il was ransomed by a billy goat (*tays*) which descended from Mount Thabīr".⁹⁰ Comparing the available lists of *isnād* shows that the main authorities on such view were either Ḥasan b. Dīnār/'Amr b. 'Ubayd (Basran, d. 142–8 H.) as reported by Ibn Ishāq, or 'Awf (b. Abī Jamīla al-'Abdī, Kūfan, d. 146–7 H.) as reported by Hushaym (b. Bashīr, Wasiṭī, d. 183 H.). Note also the exact wording of Ibn Ishāq's report from Ḥasan b. Dīnār that "Ḥasan al-Baṣrī never doubted that the *dhabīh* was Ismā'il".⁹¹)

Qatāda and Suddī were strongly associated with the pro-Ishāq view but not without sporadic and sometimes even troubled attribution of the opposite one to them.⁹²) The main tradition of Suddī was reported on the authority of Asbāṭ (b. Naṣr, Kūfan, d. ca. mid-second century) with a line going back to Abū Mālik (Ghazwān al-Ghifārī?, a Kūfan)/Abū Ṣāliḥ → Ibn 'Abbās/Murra al-Hamdānī → Ibn Mas'ūd and "other companions of the Prophet". Needless to say that each of these chains was itself associated with the pro-Ishāq view; a fact which demonstrates another clear case of traditional growing backwards. On the level of content the only new element introduced by this tradition is that when Ibrāhīm was promised to have a son from Sārah he vowed to sacrifice him and, hence, when Ishāq grew up he was reminded to fulfill his vow. Apart from that, it reiterates Ishāq's cooperation, requesting his father to bound him tight and sharpen the knife, the descension of the ram, etc., without, however, specifying the exact place of occurrence.

⁸⁹) Compare: Jaṣṣāṣ 3/465; Ibn Kathīr, Zurqānī, Sibṭ and Ālūsī, ibids; Abū Ḥayyān 3/371; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Suyūṭī 5/284.

⁹⁰) Naḥḥās 3/433; Baghawī 6/22; Ṭūsī 8/517; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Rāzī 7/149; Khāzin 5/242; Qurṭubī 7/5551; Nahrawālī 37; Suyūṭī 5/281; Diyārbakrī 1/97; Ālūsī, ibid.

⁹¹) Compare: Ṭabari, *Tārīkh* 2/269, 277; Tha'labī 60; Ibn Kathīr 4/16, 18.

⁹²) Compare: 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/73; Ibn Kathīr 4/15, 17, 19; 'Imādī 7/547; Diyārbakrī 1/95; 97; Tha'labī 61/2; Zurqānī 1/97; Suyūṭī 5/279, 283, 285, quoting Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ibn Ḥimayd and Ibn al-Mundhir; Rāzī 7/149–50; Baghawī 6/22–4; Khāzin 5/242; Ṭabarsī 23/74, 76–7; Qurṭubī 7/5543–6; Ālūsī 23/123; Ibn Khaldūn 2/68; Jaṣṣāṣ 3/465; Ṭabari, *Tārīkh* 1/267, 272–3.

Qatāda's association with the pro-Ishāq view is expressed in three different traditional statements attributed to him. In the first, transmitted by Sa'id (b. Abi 'Arūba, Baṣran, d. 156-7 H.), he says that the child whom Ibrāhīm was promised in Quran 37/101 was Ishāq.⁹³) The second one was transmitted by both Sa'id and Ma'mar. Concerning 37/112 it says that God's annunciation of Ishāq's prophecy came after he generously offered himself (*jāda bi-nafsihi*) to Him.⁹⁴) No authority is given on the third tradition which is brought only by Suyūṭī who mentions Ibn Ḥumayd for it. Though without specifying Mecca by name, but still in the context of Ishāq's sacrifice, it includes the elements of the devil's appearance to Ibrāhīm, the latter's clearing of him out of his way until he reached the *manḥar*.

To the fifth Shī'ite Imām, Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 114-8 H.) a pro-Ismā'il view was attributed through Ziyād b. Sawqa but without sufficient details.⁹⁵) However, through another authority, Muḥammad b. Shihāb (poss. Zuhri?) we hear of a tradition of his which describes the sacrifice in the context of few elements of Meccan *manāsik* (such as stating that the white, horned ram descended on the mountain to the right of the mosque of Minā) but actually fails to specify the *dhabih*.⁹⁶)

Al-Bāqir's son, Ja'far al-Šādiq (d. 148 H.) was reported by the Kūfan Mu'āwiya b. 'Ammār as describing the sacrifice of Ishāq within the context of the rituals (*manāsik*) which Ibrāhīm was shown in Mecca.⁹⁷) This tradition says that the day of Tarwiya was called as such because on it Ibrāhīm had drank and stored water (*tarawwā*), that of 'Arafa because he admitted his sins (*i'tarafa*) and learned his rituals (*'arifa*) and that of al-Naḥr because he decided to carry out the sacrifice (*naḥr*). The devil tried to lure but he stoned him and proceeded with the sacrifice.

No such or any other narrative concerning the pro-Ismā'il view was brought in the name of Ja'far al-Šādiq. From the other authorities on him, Burayd b. Mu'āwiya al-'Ijli and 'Abdullāh b. Sinān, we learn only that he held such view.⁹⁸)

4.4. From the mid-second century on more figures became identified with only one view, though in itself the debate between scholars was far from

⁹³) Ṭabari, *Tafsir*, 23/48.

⁹⁴) 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Ibn Kathir 4/19; Suyūṭī 5/285.

⁹⁵) Ibn Kathir 4/18, quoting Ibn Abi Ḥātim; Ālūsī 23/121, quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl . . .*

⁹⁶) Ṭabarsī 23/79.

⁹⁷) Qummī 2/225. Compare also with Ṭabarsī, 23-77-8.

⁹⁸) Qummī 2/226; Ṭabarsī 23/79, quoting 'Ayyāshī.

over. We also notice that the attribution of views to such figures is often made without traditional details or elaboration on the content. Examples to such cases are al-Rabi' b. Anas (Basran, d. 139–40 H.), al-Kalbi (d. 146 H.) and Shāfi'i (d. 204 H.) for the pro-Ismā'il view, and 'Abdullāh b. 'Imrān, Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 H.) and Mālik b. Anas (d. 179 H.) for the pro-Ishāq view.⁹⁹⁾

Variant degrees of details are available on the reported positions of other figures of this group. Ibn Jurayj (d. 150 H.) for example is said to have held the view that Ishāq was offered two miles from Jerusalem ('*alā milayn min ilyā'*), reported it from Wahb b. Sulaymān → Shu'ayb al-Ḥarrānī, or else attributed it to Ibn 'Abbās.¹⁰⁰⁾ Similar views were attributed to Wahb, 'Atā' and, even more often, to Ibn Jurayj's contemporary, Muqātil b. Sulaymān (d. 150 H.). It indeed appears in the *Tafsīr Muqātil* and was briefly noted by several subsequent sources.¹⁰¹⁾

The opposite, pro-Ismā'il view, on the other hand was heavily connected with the name of another contemporary, the Baṣran philologist Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' (d. 154–7 H.), albeit in varying degrees of details.¹⁰²⁾ This was usually brought in the form of a testimony by al-Aṣma'i ('Abd al-Malik b. Qarib, Baṣran, d. 213–7 H.) who asks Abū 'Amr whether the *dhabīḥ* was Ishāq. The latter, we are told, strongly rebuked Aṣma'i for loss of his mind (*ayna dhahaba/azaba 'aqluqa?*) to raise such question in the first place because it was Ismā'il who dwelt in Mecca and helped to build its sanctuary while Ishāq was never there.

The polemic character of this statement demonstrates how towards the end of the second century the establishment of Mecca's position as a ritual center became itself a kind of "primary cause" strong enough to "prove" that Ismā'il was the *dhabīḥ*; a position which the early third century *Farrā'*

⁹⁹⁾ Naḥḥās 3/431; Baghawī 6/22; Ṭabarsī 23/74; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72–3; Qurṭubī 7/5543–4; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Ālūsī 23/121 quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl* . . .; Rāzī 7/149; Zurqānī 1/97. Compare also with Sibṭ 1/298 who attributes to Mālik a pro-Ismā'il view.

¹⁰⁰⁾ Compare: Ṭabarsī, *Tārīkh* 1/249; Qurṭubī 7/5543, 5550; and the anonymous view brought by Ibn al-Athīr 1/111.

¹⁰¹⁾ *Tafsīr Muqātil*, Ms. Istanbul, III Ahmet 74/2, fols. 112 (a–b). See also: Baghawī 6/22; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/72; Rāzī 7/150; Khāzin 5/242; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Abū Ḥayyān 7/371; Sibṭ 1/302; Zurqānī 1/97; Diyārbakrī 1/95; Ālūsī 23/123.

¹⁰²⁾ Compare: Baghawī and Abū Ḥayyān, *ibids*; Ṭabarsī 23/74–5; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Rāzī 7/149; Qurṭubī 7/5544; Nasafī 4/26; Khāzin 5/243; Naysābūrī 23/67; Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Diyārbakrī 1/96, Ālūsī 23/121; Sibṭ 1/299.

(d. 207 H.) adopted too.¹⁰³) But this should not imply that the opposite view, which enjoyed such extensive traditional circulation, vanished by that time or, indeed, ever. The position attributed to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241 H.) is a case at point. The fact that his *Musnad* contained traditions pointing to the two opposite directions seems to have led some later commentators to include him under the category of those from whom the two views were reported (*fī ihdā riwāyatayn 'anhu*).¹⁰⁴) We also notice that the occurrence in *Kitāb al-Zuhd* compiled by his son 'Abdullāh of a pro-Ishāq tradition led a later scholar to think that that was Aḥmad's position.¹⁰⁵) However, a cross-examination of that source shows that this was a tradition of Sa'īd b. Jubayr reported by 'Abdullāh not from his father but rather from Layth b. Khālid al-Balkhī.¹⁰⁶)

5. *Jerusalem, Mecca and Hajj Rituals*

On few previous occasions we came across some national tunes to the two conflicting views concerning the identity of *dhabīḥ* and the place of his offering. We have also seen how forwarding the pro-Ismā'il view was part of the process of the rise of Mecca as the Abrahamic cultic center of Islam where the symbolic act of sacrifice should annually be repeated as part of the *hajj* rituals (*manāsik*). In what follows an attempt will be made at further elaboration on these issues.

5.1. Note has already been made of the early to mid-second century figures, Wahb, 'Aṭā', Muqātil and Ibn Jurayj who coupled the pro-Ishāq view with the notion that the act of offering was done in Syria, specifically Jerusalem. To these one must add the name of an earlier figure, the ex-Jewish convert Ka'b al-Aḥbār with whom such view became mostly associated.¹⁰⁷)

¹⁰³) *Farrā'*, *Ma'āni al-Qur'ān*, Cairo 1980, 2/389, commenting on Quran 37/102.

¹⁰⁴) E.g. Ibn al-Jawzi 7/73; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Ālūsī 23/121, quoting Suyūṭī's *al-Qawl . . .*

¹⁰⁵) Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr* 4/18; *idem Bidāya*, 1/159.

¹⁰⁶) Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *K. al-Zuhd*, Beirut 1981, 98–9. See also the Cairo 1987 edition, 102.

¹⁰⁷) 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Sibṭ 1/302; Ibn Kathīr 4/14; Ālūsī 23/119.

Few Muslim scholars limited themselves to neutrally noting the correlation between the two notions.¹⁰⁸) Others coupled the need to assert the pro-Ismā'il/Mecca view with a sharp defiance of "the Jews' attempt at a false diversion (*kadhīban wa-buhtānā*) because of their jealousy (*ḥasadān minhum*) of Ismā'il and, in particular, with attacking Ka'b's traditions which were seen as the source of all subsequent deviations.¹⁰⁹)

Actually we have seen how the pro-Ismā'il/Mecca tradition of 'Atā' b. Abi Rabāḥ, which was sometimes attributed to Ibn 'Abbās, was loaded with the highly polemical statement that "the Jews falsely alleged that he was Ishāq".¹¹⁰) Such national tunes were equally expressed in another tradition, that of Muḥammad b. Ka'b al-Quraḥī as transmitted from him by Burayda b. Sufyān al-Aslamī and reported by Ibn Ishāq.¹¹¹) According to it, al-Quraḥī, who was of ex-Jewish origin, relates how he mentioned the issue of *dhabīḥ* to the Umayyad caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz (d. 101 H.). The latter, we are told, expressed his ignorance of the whole matter but was ready to accept al-Quraḥī's view that it was Ismā'il (lit: *inna hādihā la-shay'un mā kuntu anzuru fīhi wa-innī la-arāhu kamā qult*). Further, 'Umar sent to a Syrian who is described as a Jewish scholar (*min'ulamā' al-yahūd*). To the question concerning the identity of *dhabīḥ*, the scholar responded: "he is Ismā'il and, by God, O' commander of the faithful, the Jews realize that but they are jealous of you Arabs having the matter of God [invested] in your father and the merit mentioned by God to him because of his endurance of what he was ordered. Hence, they deny that and allege that it was Ishāq because he is their father."

Similar national motives were expressed in three polemical verses attributed by few commentators to Abū Sa'id al-Ḍarīr where the merit bestowed by God upon Ismā'il is shared by his descendant, the Arabian prophet, Muḥammad:

inna dh-dhabīḥa, hudāta, Ismā'ilu
naṣṣa l-kitābu bi-dhāka wa-t-tanzīlu
sharafun bihi khaṣṣa l-ilāhu nabīyyanā

¹⁰⁸) Ya'qūbi, *Tārīkh*, Beirut n. d., 1/27; Mas'ūdi, *Murūj*, Cairo 1948 1/46; Rāzi 7/151; Abū al-Fidā, *al-Mukhtaṣar* Cairo 1325, 1/14.

¹⁰⁹) E. g. Ibn Kathīr 4/14 and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya in a following note.

¹¹⁰) See chapter 3.4, note (70) above.

¹¹¹) Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/268. See also: Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60-1; Zamakhsharī 3/308; Ṭabarsī 23/74-5; Khāzin 5/243; Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Suyūṭī 5/281; Ālūsī 23/122. Zurqānī, 1/99-100 and Diyārbakrī, 1/95-6 who quotes for it the early fourth century al-Mu'āfā b. Zakariyyā (d. 309 H.). Compare also with Shams al-Dīn, *Ithāf*, 2/87.

wa- atā bihi t-tafsīru wa-t-ta'wīlu
in kunta ummatahu fa-lā tabkhal lahu
*sharafan bihi qad khaṣṣahu t-tafḍīlu.*¹¹²

Such position must be contrasted with an uncommitted one expressed in verses attributed to Umayya b. Abi al-Ṣalt where the name of *dhabīh* was not specified.¹¹³ As for few later Muslim commentators, however, support to the pro-Ismā'il view could rely on the already established position of Mecca following the same line drawn by the testimony of Aṣma'il → Abū 'Amr from late second century. In Naysābūrī's words such view "is stronger" (*wa-hādhā al-aqwā*) since it also stated Minā as the place of sacrifice.¹¹⁴ To this, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya adds: "what proves that the *dhabīh* was Ismā'il is that it [the sacrifice – S.B.] was undoubtedly in Mecca. Hence, the sacrifices on the day of *al-naḥr*, the running (*sa'y*) between Ṣafā and Marwa and throwing the stones (*jimār*) were all established there as a reminder of Ismā'il and his mother who, rather than Ishāq and his mother, dwelt in Mecca. Had the sacrifice been in Syria, like it is alleged by people of the scripture (*ahl al-kitāb*) and those who took from them, then the sacrifices and *naḥr* would have been in Syria, not Mecca".¹¹⁵

5.2. Contrary to the impression created by later sources, there is a wide disagreement over the exact location of Ismā'il's sacrifice in Mecca, the place where the ransom beast exactly descended, its kinds, description and other related issues. To all intents, such disagreement reflects the long and troubled process through which the sanctity of Mecca became connected with the act of Ismā'il's sacrifice.

Traditions attributed to Ibn 'Abbās, Mujāhid, Ḍaḥḥāk, Sa'id b. Jubayr, Qatāda and 'Aṭā' b. al-Sā'ib were often quoted as variably saying that the place of sacrifice was the *manḥar*/the *manḥar* in Minā/ the *manḥar* "where sacrifice is made today"/the *manḥar* "where stones are thrown on the devil".¹¹⁶ The last variant was attributed, besides Ibn 'Abbās, to Ibn

¹¹²) Qurṭubī 7/5544; Ālūsī 23/121; Zurqānī 1/99.

¹¹³) Brought by Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/277-8; Tha'labī 63; Ālūsī, *ibid.*, and noted by Goldziher, 80, n. (1).

¹¹⁴) Naysābūrī 23/68.

¹¹⁵) Quoted in Diyārbakrī 1/95 and Qāsimī, *Maḥāsīn al-Ta'wīl*, Cairo 1959, 14/5054-5.

¹¹⁶) 'Abd al-Razzāq 245; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/276-7; Tha'labī 60; Qurṭubī 7/5550; Diyārbakrī 1/95-7; Zamakhsharī 3/307; Baydāwī 2/34; 'Imādi 7/548; Ālūsī 23/119; Abū Ḥayyān 7/370; Suyūṭī 5/284.

‘Umar, Muḥammad b. Ka‘b al-Quraḏī and Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib too.¹¹⁷⁾ With Ibn ‘Abbās and Ibn Jubayr was also connected the notion that the specific spot in question was “the rock of Minā/at the foot of mount Thabīr”.¹¹⁸⁾ From a tradition attributed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī we learn that the sacrifice was done “at a location overlooking the mosque of Minā”.¹¹⁹⁾ Finally, ‘Ubayd b. ‘Umayr says that it was rather in the *maqām*.¹²⁰⁾

Few early sources bring the *isnād* and details on some of these traditional views. The one attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās on “the *manḥar* in Minā”, for example, was transmitted through the following *isnād* brought by Ṭabarī: Salama → Ibn Ishāq → Ḥasan b. Dinār → Qatāda → Ja‘far b. Iyās → Ibn ‘Abbās. But, though it states the place of offering, it does not specify the name of *dhabīh*. Azraqī in his turn brings a tradition of Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim which describes how Ibrāhīm caught the ram on a rock named Uqayṣir (or Uqayṣir) on the foot of mount Thabīr at the gate of the path (*shī‘b*) of ‘Alī. Then the tradition mentions two possibilities of either sacrificing the ram on Uqayṣir itself or leading it from there to the *manḥar*. What calls for a special attention is the idea forwarded by it that the “mosque of the ram” (*masjid al-kabsh*) was built on that rock actually by Lubāba bint ‘Alī b. ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abbās, i. e. clearly after the turn of the century.¹²¹⁾ Fākihi indeed says that this mosque acquired its name because it was built where the ram descended.¹²²⁾ On the other hand, he brings an Ibn Jurayj → ‘Aṭā’ tradition which probably expresses the confusion prevailing at the time as to where the exact spot of sacrifice was by stating that “*al-naḥr ḥaythu yanḥar al-imām*”.¹²³⁾

5.3. Concerning the kind of the ransom beast, there is the widely circulated tradition of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī on the authority of Ibn Ishāq → ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd, noted above, which says that Ismā‘il was ransomed with a billy goat (*tays*) which descended from Thabīr.¹²⁴⁾ An interesting variant adds

¹¹⁷⁾ Qurṭubī, *ibid*.

¹¹⁸⁾ Compare: Zamakhshari, Bayḏāwī, Ālūsī, ‘Imādi, Diyārbakrī and Qurṭubī, *ibids*. See also Nasafi 4/25.

¹¹⁹⁾ Ālūsī, ‘Imādi, Diyārbakrī, Zamakhshari and Bayḏāwī, *ibids*.

¹²⁰⁾ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/277; Qurṭubī 7/5550; Ibn al-Aṭhīr 1/113.

¹²¹⁾ Azraqī, 401.

¹²²⁾ Fākihi, 472 (b).

¹²³⁾ Fol. 515 (b).

¹²⁴⁾ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/277; Baghawī 6/22; Ibn al-Jawzi 7/77; Naḥḥas 3/433; Khāzin 5/247; Ibn Kathīr 4/16; Diyārbakrī 1/97. Qurṭubī says that this was the view of ‘Alī too.

that what was meant by Quran 37/107 was not only the ransom on that specific occasion “. . . but sacrifice according to his [i. e. Ibrāhīm's – S. B.] religion, which is the *sunna* until the day of resurrection” (. . . *wa-lākinnaḥu al-dhabḥu 'alā dīnihi, fa-tilka al-sunna ilā yawm al-qiyāma* . . .).¹²⁵) Hence, this variant ends with a sentence urging the believers to sacrifice following such *sunna*. (Lit.: . . . *fa-daḥḥū 'ibāda l-lāh*).

On this background the sharp variations in the description of the ransom beast can only reflect the diverging Muslim views concerning the appropriation of sacrifice to the *sunna*. And, in itself, this explains how one variant of Ḥasan's tradition states that the ransom was a ram (*kabsh*)¹²⁶) rather than a billy goat (*tayss*) while one commentator took the trouble to add that “*tays*” actually meant an antelope (*wa'il*) which indeed appears in other sources not only as a variant of the same tradition but as one attributed to Khawwāt b. Jabayr and Ibn 'Abbās too.¹²⁷)

The relatively late authorities named for the last two traditions and the troubled chains of their *isnād* may warn that it took a long time to settle the question of such appropriation to the *sunna*. The tradition of Ibn 'Abbās was reported by Thawrī from an unnamed authority (*'an rajulin*) from Abū Ṣālih,¹²⁸) and the line of Khawwāt's has only two chains: 'Aṭā' b. Yasār and Wāqidi.¹²⁹) In fact echoes from the *wa'il* – *Kabsh* debate could still be heard through Zajjāj (d. 311 H.) who is quoted as saying that while the exegetes (*ahl al-tafsir*) hold that the ransom beast was a ram, others say that it was an antelope.¹³⁰)

The question concerning the historical context of this debate cannot be fully answered except by a mere speculation about a possible environmental origin to an ancient Arabian ritual being gradually replaced by an institutionalized *sunna* when the demand of a growing religious center for grazed livestock could not be satisfied by casual wild antelopes. However, throughout such long process one must not be surprised to see that elements from the *ḥadīth* genre infiltrate into late commentary works on 37/

¹²⁵) Ṭabari, *ibid*.

¹²⁶) Tha'labī 62; Suyūṭī 5/283, quoting Ibn Ḥumayd who, he says, referred it to 'Uthmān b. Ḥādir.

¹²⁷) Compare: Ibn al-Jawzī 7/77; Ṭūsi 8/520; Ālūsī 23/120; Ḥākim 2/555–6; Naysābūrī 23/70; Tha'labī 62; Zamakhsharī 3/307; Ibn Kathīr 4/16; Ṭabari *Tārīkh* 1/277. Other sources bring the statement on the *wa'il* without attributing it to anyone. E. g., Muqātil 112 (b); Bayḍāwī 2/34; Diyārbakrī 1/97; 'Imādī 7/548.

¹²⁸) As in Ṭabari 1/277 and Ibn Kathīr 4/16.

¹²⁹) As in Ḥākim 2/555–6 and Suyūṭī 5/281.

¹³⁰) Naḥḥās 3/433; Qurṭubī 7/5551.

107. For example, there is the notion traditionally attributed by few such works to Abū al-Ṭufayl → Ibn ‘Abbās which says that Ismā‘il was ransomed with two white prime horned rams rather than one.¹³¹⁾ Such odd information clearly originated in the notion widely cited by *ḥadīth* classicists that the Prophet had once made the same offering.¹³²⁾

Describing the ram as “a white, prime, horned one” (*amlah, a’yan, aqran*) was traditionally attributed to companions like ‘Alī and Ibn ‘Abbās or reported with minor variations from successors and other early to mid-second century figures who appear in the same *isnāds*. However, from few traditional attempts to interpret the phrase “mighty sacrifice” (*dhībḥ ‘azīm*) of Quran 37/107, one discerns clear instances of *sunna* infiltration. Of the several possible meanings given to such description note must be taken of the one traditionally attributed to Mujāhid via the link Thawrī → Ibn Abi Najīh that “‘*azīm*” meant “accepted” (*mutaqabbal*).¹³³⁾ But few commentators bring the notion that it was called “‘*azīm*” because it was fat, adding: “hence, it is the *sunna* in sacrifices” (*wa-hya al-sunna fi al-aḍāḥi*).¹³⁴⁾ It is probably of some importance to note that the earliest traditional authority named for such view is ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd who is quoted as saying that the *kabsh* was called ‘*azīm* “because the *sunna* was beaten by it and it became a religion which remains to the end of time” (lit.: *li-annahu jarat al-sunna bihi wa-ṣāra dīnan bāqiyān ākhir al-dahr*).^{134*)}

5.4. Another direction from which the connection of Mecca to the act of Ibrāhīm’s sacrifice of his son can be examined is the traditional instances where the names of certain days during the *ḥajj* ritual were explained in the context of that act. We have already noted Suddī’s tradition that Ibrāhīm was ordered to commit the sacrifice in fulfilment of the vow he made when he was promised a child. In few sources a notion counter-balancing such

¹³¹⁾ Ibn al-Jawzī 7/77; *idem Tabṣira*, cf. Sibṭ 1/297; Suyūṭī 5/284 and Ālūsī 23/120 quoting Ibn Ḥumayd.

¹³²⁾ E. g., see: Abu ‘Ubayd, (d. 224), *Gharib al-Ḥadīth*, Beirut 1976, 2/206; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, Beirut 1972, 4/379; Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* 6/236; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ* 6/77; Abū Dawūd, 2/1043-4; Abū ‘Uwāna, *Musnad* Haydarabad 1966, 5/207-10; Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, Haydarabad 1352 H. 5/238; *idem Mukhtaṣar Shu‘ab al-Īmān*, Beirut 1987, 101; Ibn al-Athīr, *Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl*, Cairo 1950, 4/127-31.

¹³³⁾ Thawrī 213; ‘Abd al-Razzāq 245; Farrā’ 2/390; Ibn al-Jawzī 7/77; Baghawī 6/22; Ṭūsī 8/520; Ālūsī 23/120; Suyūṭī 5/284, quoting Ibn Ḥumayd.

¹³⁴⁾ Naysābūrī 23/70; Rāzī 7/154; Pseudo-Ibn ‘Abbās 4/342; Khāzin 5/247; Nasafī 4/26.

^{134*)} Cf. Ālūsī 23/120.

order was forwarded; namely, that he was shown it in a dream for three consecutive nights.

The earliest form of this notion is probably the one given by Muqātil who simply states it in the context of the sacrifice of Ishāq but without further elaboration.¹³⁵ However, in two narrative variants, one by Ibn Ishāq and the other by Kalbī attributed via Abū Šāliḥ to Ibn 'Abbās, the names of three important days in the *hajj* rituals in Mecca are connected with Ibrāhīm's three consecutive dreams. On the first, we are told, "he reflected" (*tarawwā*), hence it is called *yawm al-tarwiya*. On the second "he knew" (*'arifa*) that it was God's and not the devil's order, hence it was called *yawm 'arafa*. And, on the third day he accomplished the sacrifice, hence it was called *yawm al-naḥr*.¹³⁶

Several commentators bring this notion without any tradition, source or *isnād* but either anonymously stating "it was said . . ." (*wa-qīl*) or attributing it to "some exegets" (*ba'd al-mufasssirin*).¹³⁷ The tradition: Ghannawī → Abū al-Ṭufyal → Ibn 'Abbās only explains the "origin" of *'arafa*. After teaching Ibrāhīm all the rituals in Mecca, we are told, angel Jibrīl asked him whether he knew (*hal 'arift*), hence that name.¹³⁸ However, there is a Shi'ite side of the story in the form of a tradition attributed to Ja'far al-Šādiq by Mu'āwiya b. 'Ammār. It says that at sunset of the day of *tarwiya* Jibrīl suggested to Ibrāhīm to drink and store water for himself and his family (*irtawi min al-mā' laka wa-li-ahlīk*) because there was no water source between Mecca and 'Arafa. Then, he took him to the *mawqif* and suggested that he admits his guilts and know his rituals (*i'tarif bi-dhanbika wa-'rif manāsikak*), etc.¹³⁹

5.5. The last ring by which Mecca was connected to Ibrahim's offering is the notion of stoning the devil and naming certain days during the *hajj*, noted above. In some sources one can discern a clear confusion between the devil who tried to lure Ibrāhīm and the *kabsh* who was stoned after trying to run away.¹⁴⁰ In any case most commentators assert that there lied the

¹³⁵ *Tafsir Muqātil* 112 (b); cf. also Baghawī 6/23, Qurṭubī 7/5545 and Diyārbakrī 1/96.

¹³⁶ Suyūṭī 5/283, quoting Bayhaqī's *Shu'ab al-Īmān* for the Kalbī → Abū Šāliḥ → Ibn 'Abbās tradition. For Ibn Ishāq, see: Baghawī and Diyārbakrī, ibids; Khāziri 5/244.

¹³⁷ Rāzī 7/149; Naysābūrī 23/70; Ālūsī 23/117; 'Imādī 7/546; Zamakhshari 3/307; Nasafī 4/25; Bayḍāwī 2/134; Qurṭubī 7/5546; Abū Ḥayyān 7/369.

¹³⁸ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad* 1/297.

¹³⁹ Qummi 2/225-6.

¹⁴⁰ Compare: Ṭabarī 1/275-6 and Ālūsī 23/120.

origin of the *sunna* of stoning (*ramy al-jimār*) during Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca. (Lit.: *fa-baqiyat sunna fī al-ramy/wa-hādhā al-aṣl- fī sunniyyat ramy al-jimār*).¹⁴¹) However, a cross-examination of a wide range of traditional literature on naming certain locations or describing ritual practices during the *hajj* in Mecca reveal a striking contextual disconnection from the element of Ibrāhīm's sacrifice of his son. Actually none of the *ḥadīth* compilations which I consulted bring anything on Ibrāhīm's trial in the chapters on scarifices, stoning, etc.¹⁴²) Ibn Māja brings a tradition according to which the Prophet, when asked about the sacrifices (*aḍāḥī*) said: "it is the *sunna* of your father Ibrāhīm . . ."¹⁴³) But no mention of Ismā'il is made in this context. Ṭayālisī (d. 204 H.) in his turn brings the tradition of Ḥammād → Ghannawī → Abū al-Ṭufayl → Ibn 'Abbās noted above on Jibril's teaching of Ibrāhīm the *manāsik*.¹⁴⁴) But, while in Ibn Ḥanbal and Ṭabarānī it speaks about stoning the devil and the origin of the name of 'arafa together with offering Ismā'il, this last element is strikingly missing from Ṭayālisī.

Al-Ḥākim too brings the traditions on Ibrāhīm's offering separately from those on the *manāsik* without any attempt at bridging.¹⁴⁵) And, although Fākihi does basically the same,¹⁴⁶) some of the traditions brought by him are worth noting. On the question why *yawm al-tarwiya* was called as such, he brings three traditions; two attributed to Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya (d. 81 H.) on the authority of Ṣadaqa (poss. b. Yasār, Meccan, d. in the early Abbasid era) as reported by Sufyān, and the third is of al-A'mash (Sulaymān b. Mihrān, Kūfan, d. 147-8) as reported by Shurayk (b. 'Abdullāh, Kūfan, d. 187-8).¹⁴⁷) All of them are similar in content to the above noted tradition by Ja'far al-Ṣādiq which also stated that *tarwiya* was called as such because people used to drink and store water on that day

¹⁴¹) Zamakhsharī 3/308; Nasafī 4/26; Bayḍāwī 2/34; Naysābūrī 23/71; Diyārbakrī 1/97; 'Imādī 7/548; Ālūsī *ibid*.

¹⁴²) Abū Ḥānifa, *Musnad*, Cairo 1327 H., 24-7; Mālik, *Muwatta'*, Cairo 1951, 1/393-5, 406-9; Shāfi'i, *Umm*, Beirut 1980, 2/234-9; *idem*, *Musnad*, lithog. ed. 1889, 62-80; al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb, *Musnad*, Cairo 1349 H., 2/9-12; Bukhārī 2/182-95; 4/110-9; Muslim 4/78-93; Abū Dawūd, 2/145-7; 200-1, 3/93-107; Bayhaqī, *Sunan*, 5/127-39, 228-43; Ibn al-Athīr, *Jāmi'*, 4/92-102, 121-72; Tirmidhī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Cairo 1931, 4/109-13, 132-45; Abū 'Uwāna 5/203-47; Dārimī, *Sunan*, Medina 1966, 1/382-4, 388-92; Nasā'ī, *Sunan* Cairo 1930, 5/266-77; Dāraqūṭnī, *Sunan*, Medina 1966, 2/272-6.

¹⁴³) Ibn Māja, 2/1045.

¹⁴⁴) Ṭayālisī, *Musnad*, Haydarabad 1321 H., 351-2.

¹⁴⁵) Compare with his 1/459.

¹⁴⁶) Compare with his 374 (b)-375 (a).

¹⁴⁷) 435 (b).

before departing to 'Arafāt. Such a notion, however, is brought here outside the context of sacrifice and is alien to the idea of Ibrāhīm's reflection (*tarawwī*) when ordered to make the offering.

Fākihi brings another set of traditions, four in number, which explain the origin of naming 'arafa/'arafāt but, again, outside the context of Ibrāhīm's offering and without mentioning it. The lines of their *isnād* runs as follows: 1) Mu'tamir (d. 187-8 H.) → his father (Sulaymān b. Ṭarakhān, Baṣran d. 143) → Abū Mujliz (al-Sadūsī). 2) Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd (Kufan, d. 203-5) → 'Abd al-Malik (b. Abī Sulaymān al-'Arzamī? d. 145) → 'Aṭā'. 3) Ibn Jurayj → Nu'aym (b. Abī Hind? Kūfan d. 110 H.). 4) 'Aṭā' b. al-Sā'ib → Sa'id b. Jubayr → Ibn 'Abbās.¹⁴⁸) Note especially this last tradition which even include the element of Ibrāhīm's stoning of the devil, but without mentioning the offering of his son.

Quite the same is done by Azraqī who brings three traditions reported all by 'Uthmān b. Sāj (al-Jazarī, *mawlā* of B. Umayya, d. ca. 180 H.). One of them is attributed to Mujāhid on the authority of Khuṣayf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān (al-Jazarī al-Ḥarrānī, *mawlā* of B. Umayya, d. 136-9 H.). The second and third were reported from Ibn Ishāq and Zuhayr b. Muḥammad (d. 162 H.), respectively, without further *isnād* given.¹⁴⁹) All these traditions describe how, after Ibrāhīm completed building the Ka'ba, Jibril showed him the rituals connected with visiting it: circummambulation, prayer behind the *maqām*, Ṣafā, Marwa, Muzdalifa and 'Arafa. When he entered Minā (in one variant: on the day of *al-naḥr*), the devil confronted Ibrāhīm three times but was stoned in each of them. Finally when he was taken to 'Arafa, Jibril asked him whether he knew his *manāsik* (var.: whether he knew what he was shown for three nights) and, hence, the name "Arafāt" . . . etc.

5.6. Support to the current which promoted Mecca as the place of offering comes from few traditions which testify to the existence of the two horns of the ram in the Ka'ba in early Islam. Several commentaries bring this testimony as an additional or independent proof to such view (lit: *ḥujja ukhrā/dalīlun mustaqill/yadulla 'alayhi/dalla 'alā annahu . . .*, etc.). They also add that the two horns have been hanging in the Ka'ba until they were burned during the war between Ḥajjāj and Ibn al-Zubayr.¹⁵⁰)

Apparently, these commentaries rely on the traditional information that the two horns were there when the Prophet entered Mecca. Such infor-

¹⁴⁸) 516(b)-517(a), 525(a).

¹⁴⁹) Azraqī, 402.

¹⁵⁰) Zamakhshari 3/308; Ibn Kathir 4/17; Rāzī 7/149-50; Naysābūrī 23/68; Nasafī 4/26; Bayḍāwī 2/134; Diyārbakrī 1/96; 'Imādī 7/546.

mation was circulated by Sufyān b. 'Uyayna (Kūfan who lived in Mecca, d. 198 H.) through the *isnād*: Maṣū' b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajabī (Meccan, d. 137–8 H.) → his uncle Musāfi' b. Shayba (al-Ḥajabī Meccan, d. 86–96) → his aunt, Ṣafiyyā bint Shayba → a woman from Sulaym.¹⁵¹) It is clearly a local Meccan tradition of the family of Banū Shayba, custodians of the Ka'ba. We learn from it that the Sulamī woman testified how the Prophet, when returning the keys of the Ka'ba to 'Uthmān b. Ṭalḥa, told him that he saw the two horns hanging there and that he forgot to ask him to cover them lest they occupy the attention of people who pray there. We also notice that the tradition ends with a note by its circulator, Sufyān, that the horns remained hanging until the Ka'ba was burned.

Evidence to the existence of the two horns come from other directions. Ibn 'Abbās is traditionally reported as swearing that the head of the *kabsh* was in early Islam still hanging (var.: by the horns) from the roof gutler of the Ka'ba and that it was very dry. The *isnād* usually brought for this tradition is: Ibn Ishāq → Ḥasan b. Dinār → Qatāda → Ja'far b. Iyās → Ibn 'Abbās.¹⁵²)

Another tradition, uniquely reported by Azraqī, attribute to 'Amr b. Qays (d. 136–46 H.) the confirmation that the two horns of the *kabsh* were hanging on the wall of the Ka'ba until the time of Ibn Zubayr. However, it does not mention their being burned but says that when the Ka'ba was rebuilt in his time they were revealed but they were so old that when Ibn al-Zubayr touched them they disintegrated.¹⁵³)

As for the question who actually saw the two horns hanging in the Ka'ba, Azraqī and 'Abd al-Razzāq bring two traditions from the mid-second century traditionist Ibn Jurayj.¹⁵⁴) According to one of them Ibn Jurayj asked 'Abdullāh/'Abd al-Ḥamid b. Shayba b. 'Uthmān whether the two horns were in the Ka'ba. When this was affirmed Ibn Jurayj persisted whether he had himself seen them. However, the answer was reported in the words of Ibn Jurayj as follows: "I think that he said: my father saw them". As for the second tradition it simply states that an old woman confirmed to Ibn Jurayj seeing the two horns.

¹⁵¹) Al-Ḥumaydi (d. 219 H.) *Musnad*, Beirut and Cairo, 1382 H. 1/257; 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, Beirut 1972, 5/88; Azraqī 156; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 4/68, 5/380; Ibn Kathīr 4/17; Suyūṭī 5/284.

¹⁵²) Compare: 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 5/87; Ṭabarī *Tārīkh* 1/275–6; Tha'labī 62; Baghawī 6/22; Ibn Kathīr 4/15; Khāzin 5/243; Qurtubī 7/5550; Diyār-bakrī 1/96.

¹⁵³) Azraqī, 156.

¹⁵⁴) Azraqī, *ibid*; 'Abd al-Razzāq, 5/87.

The last traditional testimony for seeing the two horns in the Ka'ba bears the name of the early second century Sha'bi. It enjoyed a much wider circulation by later commentators though only Ṭabarī mentions the two authorities on it, Dawūd (b. Abī Hind) and Jābir (al-Ju'fi).¹⁵⁵ However its wording is highly polemical and usually occurs as part of the "proof" that the *dhabīh* was Ismā'il. Such polemical nature is indirectly demonstrated by people like Ṭabarī himself and Naḥḥas who held that the testimony of the two horns being hanged in the Ka'ba is not sufficient proof that the *dhabīh* was Ismā'il since they could have been transferred to it from Syria (lit.: *lā wajha li-i'tilāli man i'talla . . .*).¹⁵⁶ From the wording of Qurṭubī who also was of the same opinion we even learn that such indeed was the reaction of those who held that the sacrifice occurred in Syria (lit.: *ajāba man qāla anna al-dhabḥa waqa'a bi-al-shām: la'alla al-ra's ḥumila min al-shām ilā makka, wa-llāhu a'lam.*)¹⁵⁷

Actually, support to the view that the two horns were transferred from Jerusalem to Mecca, albeit by the early Abbasids, comes from a unique tradition of the Jerusalemite family of 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr b. Thābit brought by several works on the merits (*faḍā'il*) of Jerusalem. It says that "a unique pearl, the two horns of the *kabsh* of Ibrāhīm and the crown of Kisrā were hanging by a chain in the middle of the Dome of the Rock during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. When the caliphate passed to Banū Hāshim [i. e. the Abbasids – S. B.] they transferred them to the Ka'ba".¹⁵⁷ However, two sources reveal a clear attempt to attribute this tradition to Ibn 'Abbās in spite of the fact that the latter reportedly died long before the Abbasids arrived to power.¹⁵⁸

6. Conclusions

On different occasions throughout the present study review was made of the positions attributed to first century and reported from second and early third century figures on the questions who was the *dhabīh*, where did the act of offering occur and related issues. Understandably enough, the extensive traditional material reviewed above did not allow for an easy answer to Muslim scholars and commentators after the third century. Indeed,

¹⁵⁵ Compare: Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* 1/268; Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60; Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Khāzin 5/243; Diyārbakrī 1/96.

¹⁵⁶ Ṭabarī 1/270-1; Naḥḥās 3/431-2.

¹⁵⁷ Musharraf, *Faḍā'il*, Ms. Tübingen 27, fol. 47 (a); Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā'il*, Jerusalem 1979, 75-6; Shams al-Dīn, *Ithāf*, 1/224; Mujir al-Dīn, *al-Uns*, Beirut and Amman 1973, 1/275.

¹⁵⁸ Miknāsī, *Kitāb Fīhi Faḍā'il*, Ms. Tübingen 25, 53 (b); Shams al-Dīn, 1/162.

people like Jāhiz (d. 255 H.), Ya'qūbī (d. 282 H.) and Tustarī (d. 283 H.) could be distinguished among third century scholars who refrained from taking any definite position on the matter.¹⁵⁹) Though it is the early fourth century Zajjāj (d. 311 H.) whose outward refrainment was noted by later sources as "a third [distinct] view" (*madhhab thālith*), the same can be discerned from the words of Jaṣṣās (d. 370 H.), Tha'labī (d. 427 H.) and Rāzī.¹⁶⁰)

Of those scholars who took a pro-Ishāq position, note must be made of Ṭabarī, Nahhās, Qādī 'Iyād, Suhayli, Jilāni, Ibn al-Jawzī, Qurṭubī, Zurqānī and possibly others too.¹⁶¹) Suyūṭī, though was noted once as tending to accept this view, seems to have vacillated.¹⁶²)

The opposite, pro-Ismā'il view was adopted by the early fourth century Jubbā'i (d. 303 H.),¹⁶³) "most of the traditionists"¹⁶⁴) though only Ibn Abi Ḥātim was specified by name,¹⁶⁵) the two Shī'its Ṭūsī and Ṭabarsī¹⁶⁶) and other scholars and commentators like Abū Bakr b. 'Arabi,¹⁶⁹) Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Nawawī and Subkī,¹⁷⁰) Nasafī,¹⁷¹) Naysābūrī,¹⁷²) Ibn Kathīr,¹⁷³) Baydāwī,¹⁷⁴) 'Imādī,¹⁷⁵) 'Ālūsī,¹⁷⁶) 'Aynī and possibly others too.¹⁷⁷)

With the main reasons brought for preferring either view we have already dealt. In itself, the impressively long list of mainly late scholars and commentators who favoured Ismā'il confirms Goldziher's note that

¹⁵⁹) Jāhiz, *al-Hayawān*, Beirut 1969, 1/163 but compare with 4/84; Ya'qūbī 1/27. Tustarī, *Tafsīr*, Cairo 1329, 79, does not even address the problem.

¹⁶⁰) Jaṣṣās 3/465; Tha'labī 61; Rāzī 7/151.

¹⁶¹) Cf. Zurqānī 1/97 and Ālūsī 23/121. 'Aynī, though not favouring this view himself, quotes for it also Ibn al-Ṭin. *Umdat al-Qārī* 15/258.

¹⁶²) Compare: Zurqānī 1/97 and Qāsīmī 14/5057.

¹⁶³) Cf. Ṭabarsī 23/74.

¹⁶⁴) Cf. Ḥākim 2/559.

¹⁶⁵) Cf. Ibn Kathīr 4/18; Zurqānī 1/97; Ālūsī 23/121.

¹⁶⁶) Fākihī 472 (b).

¹⁶⁷) See his *Asās al-Ta'wīl*, Beirut 1960, 124-6.

¹⁶⁸) 8/517 and 23/74, respectively.

¹⁶⁹) *Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, Beirut 1972, 4/1619.

¹⁷⁰) Cf. Qāsīmī 14/5054; Diyārbakrī 1/96; Zurqānī 1/98; Nahrawālī 37.

¹⁷¹) Nasafī 4/26.

¹⁷²) Naysābūrī 23/68.

¹⁷³) Ibn Kathīr 4/14-9.

¹⁷⁴) Baydāwī 2/134.

¹⁷⁵) 'Imādī 7/546.

¹⁷⁶) Ālūsī 23/124.

¹⁷⁷) 'Aynī, 15/258, refers also to Kirmānī as holding this view.

this view eventually emerged victorious.¹⁷⁸⁾ In view of the present study, however, one must immediately add that such victory was facilitated only as part of the general process of promoting the position of Mecca as the cultic center of Islam by connecting it with the Biblical heritage on the story of Abraham's trial or, to use Wansbrough's terminology, the reproduction of an Arabian-Hijāzī version of Juedo-Christian "prophetology".¹⁷⁹⁾ The other, more committed view of Goldziher that the Prophet and people of the first century did not doubt that the *dhabīh* was Ishāq,¹⁸⁰⁾ can be accepted only if viewed as pointing to an Islamic phase which preceded that process. For, our attempt to date the relevant traditional material confirms on the whole the conclusions which Schacht arrived at from another field, specifically the tendency of *isnāds* to grow backwards.¹⁸¹⁾ Time and again it has been demonstrated how serious doubts could easily be cast not only against traditions attributed to the Prophet and companions but a great deal of those bearing the names of successors too. We have actually seen how the acute struggle of clear national motive to promote the positions of Ismā'il and Mecca did not flare up before the turn of the century, was at its height when the Abbasids assumed power and remained so throughout the rest of the second century.

Though we did not initially aim at investigating the development of Muslim *hajj* rituals in Mecca, let alone its religious position in early Islam in general, our enquiry strongly leads to the conclusion that such issues were far from settled during the first half of the second century. While few scholars have lately arrived at similar conclusions from different directions,¹⁸²⁾ it is Goldziher who must be accredited with the initial note that Muslim consecration of certain locations in the Hijaz commenced with the rise of the Abbasids to power.¹⁸³⁾ Indeed we have seen how "the mosque of the ram" was one of such locations.

¹⁷⁸⁾ *Die Richtungen* . . . , 81 n. (3), (4).

¹⁷⁹⁾ J. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, Oxford 1977, 58, 179. Indeed several scholars noted that the pro-Ishāq view is the "consensus of the people of scripture: (*ijmā'* / *ajma'a* 'alayhi / *yattafiq* / *dhababa ilayhi ahl al-kitāb*). Compare Baghawī 6/22; Tha'labī 60; Qurṭubī 7/5543; Khāzin 5/242; Sibṭ 1/298; Naysābūri 23/68; Ibn Kathīr 4/14; Zurqānī 1/97; Diyārbakrī 1/95.

¹⁸⁰⁾ Goldziher, 79, n. (2) draws on John the Damascene's implication that Muslims of his time believed the *dhabīh* was Ishāq. Cf. C. H. Becker, *Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie*, 26/182.

¹⁸¹⁾ J. Schacht. *Origins* . . . London 1950. 107. 156.

¹⁸²⁾ G. R. Hawting has lately argued that Islam does not seem to have one firmly established cultic center in the first century, *The First Dynasty of Islam*, London 1986, 6-7. Before that Kister has shown how the struggle between Mecca and Jerusalem over primacy in Islam goes to the first half of the second century. "You Shall Only Set . . .", *Le Museon* 82, 1969, 178-84, 194.

¹⁸³⁾ Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, N. Y. 1971, 2/279-81.