

ARABICA

Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies

Fondée par E. Lévi-Provençal
et publiée avec le concours du Centre National de la
Recherche Scientifique de France

La Revue ARABICA, organe des arabisants français, largement ouverte à la collaboration extérieure, paraît trois fois par an. Elle publie des études, des documents et des notes sur la langue, la littérature, l'histoire et la civilisation du monde arabe, ainsi que sur l'influence de la culture arabe sur la culture occidentale; un bulletin critique; une chronique du monde arabisant. Les publications et ouvrages envoyés pour rendre compte, ainsi que la correspondance concernant la rédaction et l'impression (manuscripts et épreuves), doivent être envoyés à la

RÉDACTION D'ARABICA

13 RUE DE SANTEUIL - 75231 PARIS Cedex 05

Les ouvrages adressés à la Rédaction d'Arabica qui, pour des raisons diverses, ne pourraient faire l'objet d'un compte rendu, seront mentionnés à la rubrique «Livres reçus».

* * *

Directeur: M. M. ARKOUN.

Comité de patronage: MM. M. BERGÉ, G. BOHAS, D. CHEVALLIER, N. ELISSÉEFF, T. FAHD, A. MIQUEL, A. RAYMOND.

Conseil de direction: M^{mcs} et MM. J. CHABBI, A. CHEIKH-MOUSSA, P. CRONE, G. DELANOUÉ, Cl. GILLIOT, B. HALFF, B. JOHANSEN, J. JOLIVET, J. LANGHADE, P. LARCHER, Y. RACHEB, C. J. ROBIN, A. ROMAN, J. SUBLET, G. TROUPEAU.

Comité de rédaction: MM. A. CHEIKH-MOUSSA, Cl. GILLIOT, P. LARCHER, Y. RACHEB.

Secrétaire de rédaction: M. N. ELSAKHAWI.

PRIX DE SOUSCRIPTION AU VOLUME XLI (1994) (3 fasc. d'environ 144 p. chacun): 170 Florins hollandais pour les institutions et 115 Florins hollandais pour les abonnements personnels (*les frais d'expédition en plus*).

Les abonnements sont reçus par MM. E. J. BRILL, B.P. 9000, 2300 PA LEIDEN (Hollande), éditeurs d'ARABICA.

All prices and postage & handling charges are exclusive of VAT in EC-countries.
(VAT not applicable outside the EC)

This journal is printed on acid-free paper.

TRANSLITTÉRATION DE L'ARABE:

ʾ, b, t, ṭ, ḡ, h, ḥ, d, ḏ, r, z, s, š, ṣ, ḍ, ṯ, z, ʿ, ġ, f, q, k, l, m, n, h, w, y.
lā marbūṭa = a, at (état construit). ARTICLE: *al-* et *l-* (même devant les «solaires»).

VOYELLES: a, i, u, — ā, ī, ū. DIPHTONGUES: aw, ay.

ARABICA

JOURNAL OF ARABIC AND ISLAMIC STUDIES

VOLUME XLI



E. J. BRILL, LEIDEN
1994

THE FIRST-CENTURY CONCEPT OF HIĞRA*

BY

PATRICIA CRONE

IN SOURCES for the first century of Islamic history, the word *hiğra* is used of two different types of emigration. Most commonly, it refers to emigration from Mecca to Medina in the time of the Prophet: this is the classical meaning of the word. But at other times it stands for emigration from Medina and other parts of Arabia to garrison cities in the conquered lands after the Prophet's death, which is not classical usage. Participants in both types of emigration are known as *muhāğirūn*. How are the two meanings of the word related?

Most scholars undoubtedly envisage the classical meaning as original and the non-classical usage as a later development. "Hijra no longer meant Flight, but emigration (with wife and children) to a military and political centre in order to serve there", as Wellhausen says with reference to the post-conquest period¹. In a recent study Madelung adopts the same view and traces the non-classical usage to 'Umar: "The duty of *hiğra* acquired renewed, if changed, significance with the expansion of Islam after the death of Muḥammad"; reaffirmed by the caliph 'Umar, the "renewed emigration. ... was no longer directed to Medina but to the newly founded garrison towns in the conquered territories. With this interpretation, the duty of *hiğra*, based on the precedent of the Prophet's time, remained a vital institution throughout the

* I should like to thank Uri Rubin for permission to quote his unpublished article, and Michael Cook, Frank Stewart and Fritz Zimmermann for helpful comments on earlier drafts of mine.

¹ J. Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and its Fall*, Calcutta 1927, p. 25 (my italics). For the non-classical concept see also K. Athamina, "Ağāb and Muhāğirūn in the Environment of the *Aṣṣār*", *Studia Islamica* 66 (1987), p. 9, and the richly informative survey by U. Rubin, "Hiğra and Muhāğirūn in Early Islam", unpublished paper presented at the Fourth International Colloquium on the transition 'From Gahiliyya to Islam', Jerusalem 1987, to which I am much indebted.

Umayyad caliphate"². Thereafter, one takes it, the concept reverted to the meaning that it had in the Prophet's days.

But there is something uncomfortable about a reconstruction in which a concept is born with its classical meaning so that evidence for the century after the Prophet's death must relate to a diversion rather than the development from which the classical concept emerged. One would have expected the first century to be formative. This is not how the sources see it, of course, for they systematically equate their own, classical Islam with that of the Prophet and the *Rāšidūn* and so have no choice but to dismiss the pre-classical period as diversionary or positively aberrant. For example, they assure us that the caliphal title was born under Abū Bakr in its classical form of *ḥalīfat rasūl allāh*, though it was not actually used in that form until the 'Abbāsīd period: this was because the Umayyads 'changed' it³. They also assure us that the canonical taxes were fixed by the Prophet and 'Umar, but that the Umayyads changed them too⁴, and that the Umayyads were in general wont to introduce innovations, though the original rules always won out in the end because the scholars 'remembered' how things had been under the Prophet and the *Rāšidūn*. But this is history as legitimation. In Madelung's reconstruction it is 'Umar who changes the original concept of *hiğra*, not the Umayyads, who merely favour the un-classical idea; but one suspects the sources of doctrinal rewriting yet again. Is it not possible to propose a history of the concept of *hiğra* in which the classical notion is the outcome of an evolution rather than its starting point? This is what will be attempted here.

Emigration in the Qur'ān

The Qur'ān is generally assumed to be a faithful record of Muḥammad's utterances, indeed the only reliable record that we possess. Wansbrough has cast doubt on this assumption, with considerable justification in my opinion⁵, but his theory is not suffi-

² W. Madelung, "Has the *Hijra* Come to an End?", *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 54 (1986) (*Mélanges D. Sourdel*), p. 226.

³ P. Crone and M. Hinds, *God's Caliph. Religious Authority in the First Centuries of Islam*, Cambridge 1986, ch. 2.

⁴ See for example Wellhausen, *Kingdom*, pp. 277ff.

⁵ J. Wansbrough, *Qur'anic Studies*, Oxford 1977; id., *The Sectarial Milieu*, Oxford 1978.

ciently concrete to be usable in the present context. Since the Qur^ānic evidence cannot simply be left aside, and since further the scholars who have worked on *hiġra* subscribe to the conventional view of the provenance and transmission history of the Qur^ān, I shall meet them halfway by adopting it myself for purposes of the present argument.

The Qur^ān does not actually use the term *hiġra*, but it pays considerable attention to emigrants (*man yuhāġiru, al-muhāġirūn*), of whom it strongly approves. They are identified as believers (2:217/215 [the figures separated by a dash refer to the Egyptian and Flügel editions respectively]; 8:71, 73/73, 75; 9:19/20; 29:25; 33:5/6), and their emigration is regularly presented as a response to maltreatment: we hear of “those who emigrated and were expelled from their habitations, those who suffered hurt in My way” (3:194), “Those who emigrated in God’s cause after they were wronged” (16:40/43), of “poor *muhāġirūn* who were expelled from their homes and their property” (59:7/8), and of “those who emigrated *min ba[‘]di mā futinū*”, usually translated “after persecution” (16:109/111); when people complain of being *mustaḍ[‘]afūn fi ‘l-ard*, the angels ask why they have not emigrated (4:96/99); and those who emigrate in God’s cause are assured that they will find *murāġaman kaḡīran*, sometimes translated “many refuges” (4:99/101). But no persecution seems to be envisaged in the passage on Lot, who believed in Abraham saying, “I will emigrate unto my Lord” (29:25), unless the words are to be construed as Abraham’s.

Emigrants, who were often poor (cf. 24:21/22; 59:7/8), are contrasted with unbelievers and believers who have stayed behind: emigrants should not have friends in either group, though they should assist their co-religionists when the latter ask for help as long as it does not require action against allies (4:88/91; 8:71/73). The Qur^ān makes it clear that Muḡammad has emigrated (33:49) and that others are expected to join him (4:88/91; 8:71/73; 60:9/10); rewards are held out to those who go out *muhāġiran ilā ‘llāh wa-rasūlihi* even if they die on the way (4:99/101). We are not told where people emigrated from or to, though it is clear that their destination was a place with earlier inhabitants, who were also believers (59:8/9).

The most striking characteristic of emigrants in the Qur^ān is their association with holy war. Rewards are held out to “those who emigrated ... and fought and were slain” (3:194), “those who

emigrated and were slain or died” (22:57), “those who believe and have emigrated and struggled with their possessions and their selves in the way of God” (8:71/73; 9:19/20), “those who believe and have emigrated and struggle in the way of God” (8:73/75), “those who have believed afterwards and emigrated, and struggled with you” (8:74/76), “those who emigrated after persecution, then struggled and endured” (16:109/111); and one verse seems to identify *ġihād* as an activity peculiar to emigrants as distinct from those “who have given refuge and help” (8:71/73). Emigration and warfare are meritorious for being performed *fi sabīl allāh*, suggesting that they could also be performed in a non-religious vein (as warfare obviously could); and it seems reasonable to infer that *hiġra*, *ġihād* and *qitāl* alike were secular terms in pre-Islamic times. This is also suggested by the fact that the Qur^ān hardly ever associates them with earlier prophets. One would have expected Abraham and Moses to figure prominently as *muhāġirūn*, and Moses to be presented as a war-leader too, given that Abraham was not only the first monotheist, but also the first to separate himself from his unbelieving people (as Ḥadīth is well aware), while Moses staged the exodus from Egypt which culminated in the Israelite conquest of the Holy Land. But Lot is the only prophet before Muhammad to be described as a *muhāġir*; and not a single earlier prophet is depicted as a protagonist of *ġihād/qitāl*.

Emigration to garrison cities

Most Islamicists probably assume the Qur^ānic and the classical concepts of *ġihād* to be identical or so closely related that the one developed into the other without intervening links. But is it not possible that the non-classical concept of *hiġra* was such a link? Since the evidence has not been systematically collected before, I shall begin by listing all the attestations of the non-classical concept known to me⁶ (except for the Ḥārīġite material, which will be considered later). The order of the list is chronological and based on the approximate time to which the passages refer, not on their time of origin or the dates of the works in which they are preserved.

⁶ I owe many of the attestations to the authors cited above, notes 1-2, especially Rubin, and also to J.M.D.M. Jūda, *al-‘Arab wa ‘l-ard̄ fi ‘l-‘Irāq̄ fi ṣadr al-Islām*, Amman 1979, pp. 228ff.

1. The Prophet predicted that “you will emigrate to Syria and conquer it”⁷.

2. The Prophet said that “there will be *hiğra* after *hiğra*”, adding that “the best people on earth will be those who attach themselves most closely to Abraham’s place of emigration (*muhāğar*)”⁸.

3. Abū Darr described Syria as *ard al-hiğra* in conversation with the Prophet⁹.

4. The Prophet cursed those who turned bedouin after having emigrated (*man badā baʿda hiğratihī*), but exonerated those who did so in times of *fitna*¹⁰. Since there was no *fitna* in the Prophet’s time, this must refer to people who abandoned their *hiğra* after his death, be it in Kūfa (below, nos. 32-3), Basra (nos. 33, 43), the Yemen (no. 56) or Medina¹¹.

5. The Prophet told his followers to invite the enemy to convert before engaging them in battle: if they accept, then “invite them to transfer from their abode to the abode of the emigrants” (*al-tahawwul min dārihim ilā dār al-muhāğirīn*), and tell them that they will have the same rights and duties as the Muhāğirūn; if they refuse to move, “then tell them that they will be like the bedouin Muslims (*aʿrāb al-muslimīn*), who are subject to God’s law on a par with the believers, but who do not share in the *fay*’ or the *ganīma* unless they fight *ğihād* with the Muslims. And if they refuse to adopt Islam, then ask them to pay *ğizya*”¹². The Prophet is here speaking of non-

⁷ Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, Cairo 1895, vol. v, p. 241.

⁸ Abū Dāwūd, *al-Sunan*, ed. M. M.-D. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut n.d., vol. iii, no. 2482; Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, ed. A.M. Shākir, Cairo 1950-, vol. vii, no. 5562 (m2); vol. xi, nos. 6871, 6952; Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīḥ madīnat Dimāšq*, vol. i, ed. Ṣ.D. al-Munağğid, Damascus 1951, pp. 149ff.; further references in Rubin, ‘Hiğra and Muhāğirūn’, note 68.

⁹ ʿAlī b. Abī Bakr al-Haytamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid wa-manbaʿ al-fawāʿid*, third printing, Beirut 1982, vol. v, p. 223; al-Muttaqī al-Hindī, *Kanz al-ʿummāl fi sunan al-aqwāl wa ʿl-afʿāl*, second edition, Hyderabad 1945-75, vol. v, p. 469, no. 2597 (contrast no. 2602 at p. 470, which omits this for an identification of Medina as the Prophet’s *muhāğar*).

¹⁰ Haytamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 254; M.J. Kister, ‘Land Property and *Jihād*’, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 34 (1991), p. 279n, both citing al-Ṭabarānī; cf. C.E. Bosworth, ‘A note on *Taʿarrub* in Early Islam’, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989), p. 359.

¹¹ Cf. below, notes 143-5.

¹² ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī, *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥ.-R. al-Aʿzamī, Beirut 1970-2, vol. v, no. 9428; Ibn Abī Ṣayba, *Kitāb al-muṣannaf fi ʿl-aḥādīṯ wa ʿl-āṭār*, ed. M.A. al-Nadwī, Bombay 1979-83, vol. xii, nos. 12678, 1400; Abū

Arabs joining (or refusing to join) the Muhāğirūn outside Arabia, not of Arabs joining those in Medina, as is clear partly from the fiscal terminology he employs and partly from the fact that the tradition is also ascribed to ʿUmar¹³.

6. In 12/633f Ḥālid b. al-Walīd offered the people of Ḥīra the same rights and duties as the Muslims if they would convert, get up and emigrate (*in aslamtum wa-nahađtum wa-hāğartum*)¹⁴.

7. The Arab who killed the Persian Ruzbih in the battle of Ḥuṣayd in Iraq in 12/633f was one of the Barara: every clan that migrated (*hāğarat*) in its entirety was known as *al-Barara*, whereas groups that migrated in part were known as *al-Ḥiyara*, so the Muslims consisted of *Ḥiyara* and *Barara*¹⁵.

8. ʿAmr b. Maʿdīkarib apostatized in the Yemen, then he *hāğara ilā ʿl-ʿIrāq* and converted¹⁶.

9. ʿAmr b. Maʿdīkarib addressed the participants in the battle of Qādisiyya, fought between 14/635 and 17/637, as *maʿṣar al-muhāğirīn*¹⁷.

10. Groups of Tağlib, Namir and Iyād from the Ğazīra *hāğara* to al-Madāʿin, whence they later transferred to Kufa¹⁸.

11. ʿUmar instructed Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ to create a *dār hiğra wa-manzil ġihād* for the Muslims¹⁹, or a *dār hiğra wa-qayrawānan*²⁰, or a *dār hiğra* for the Arabs who were with him. So he went to al-Anbār to make it a *dār al-hiğra*, then he went to Kuwayfa and then to the site on which Kufa was built in 17/638²¹.

12. The poet al-Muḥabbal and his son *hāğara* to Baṣra²².

ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām, *Kitāb al-amwāl*, ed. M.Kh. Harās, Cairo 1968, pp. 303f., no. 523; al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-mağāzī*, ed. M. Jones, London 1966, vol. ii, p. 757 (different *isnād*); further references in Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, note 83.

¹³ Madelung, ‘Hijra’, pp. 232f., citing al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīḥ al-rusul wa ʿl-mulūk*, ed. M.J. de Goeje and others, Leiden 1879-1901, ser. i, pp. 2713f.

¹⁴ Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 2041.

¹⁵ Sayf in Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 2069; cf. the glossary, s.v. *brr*.

¹⁶ Ibn Qutayba, *al-Šiʿr wa ʿl-šūʿarāʿ*, ed. A.M. Shākir, Cairo 1966-7, vol. i, p. 372.

¹⁷ Abū ʿl-Farağ al-Iṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-ağānī*, Cairo 1927-74, vol. xv, p. 215, bottom; Ibn Abī Ṣayba, *Muṣannaf*, vol. xii, no. 15590.

¹⁸ Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 2482.

¹⁹ Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 2360.

²⁰ Al-Balāğurī, *Kitāb futūḥ al-buldān*, ed. M.J. de Goeje, Leiden 1866, p. 275.

²¹ Al-Dīnawarī, *al-Aḥbār al-ḥiwāl*, ed. V. Guirgass, Leiden 1888, p. 131.

²² Ibn Qutayba, *Šiʿr*, vol. i, p. 240.

13. Rabī'a, the son of al-Namir b. Tawlab, *hāğara* to Kufa²³.
14. When Sağāh converted to islam, she *hāğarat* to Başra²⁴.
- 15a. Kilāb b. Umayya b. al-Askar al-Laytī *hāğara* to Medina in the caliphate of 'Umar according to some; according to others, he had already done so in the time of the Prophet²⁵; he and his brother subsequently *hāğara* with Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāş, i.e. to Iraq²⁶.
16. Kurayb b. Abraha and his brother Abū Šamir *hāğara* to Egypt in the caliphate of 'Umar^{26a}.
16. In 17/638 'Alī told 'Umar that Kufa was *li 'l-hiğra ba'da 'l-hiğra*²⁷.
17. 'Umar held the best person to be a man endowed with a home, family and property who learns about Islam and who reacts by driving his camels to "one of the abodes of emigration (*dār min dūr al-hiğra*)", where he sells them and spends the money on equipment in the path of God, staying among the Muslims and confronting their enemy²⁸.
18. Tustar reneged on its agreement, so the *muhāğirūn* had to conquer it²⁹.
19. Between 19/640 and 21/642 'Utmān b. Abī 'l-Āş conquered Tawwağ in Fārs, *fa-sayyarahū dār hiğra*³⁰.
20. The Coptic saint Samuel of Qalamūn predicted the coming of "this *umma* who are the *muhāğirūn*" and *ummat al-hiğra al-ʿarabiyya*³¹.

²³ Ibn Qutayba, *Šiʿr*, vol. i, p. 309; Jūda, *al-ʿArab*, p. 231, with reference to Balāğurī, *Ansāb*, MS, vol. ii, p. 788.

²⁴ Balāğurī, *Futūh*, p. 100.

²⁵ *Ağānī*, vol. xxi, pp. 9f.; Ibn Ḥağar, *al-Işāba fī tamyīz al-Şahāba*, ed. A. Sprenger and others, Calcutta 1856-73, vol. i, pp. 28, 125f., s.vv. 'Ubayy b. Umayya', 'Umayya b. al-Askar'.

²⁶ Ibn Ḥağar, *Işāba*, vol. i, p. 127, on the ultimate authority of al-Zuhrī.

^{26a} Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, *Futūh Mişr wa-ahbārūhā*, ed. C. C. Torrey, New Haven 1922, p. 113.

²⁷ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2514.

²⁸ Ibn al-Mubāarak, *Kitāb al-ğihād*, ed. N. Ḥammād, Beirut 1971, no. 164.

²⁹ Balāğurī, *Futūh*, pp. 381f.; 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muʿannaf*, vol. v, no. 9656; al-Saraḥsī, *Şarḥ kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr li-Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Şaybānī*, Cairo 1957, vol. i, p. 259.

³⁰ Dīnawarī, *Ahbār*, p. 141.

³¹ R. Basset (ed. and tr.), «Le Synaxaire arabe jacobite (Rédaction copte)» in *Patrologia Orientalis*, ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau, vol. iii, Paris 1909, p. 408; J. Ziadeh (ed. and tr.), «L'Apocalypse de Samuel, supérieur de Dair el Qalamoun», *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 20 (1915-17), pp. 377, 382, 389 and *passim*.

21. The Muslims appear as *Magaritai* in two Egyptian papyri of 642 and 643³².
22. 'Umar identified the participants in a campaign against Kurds as *muhāğirūn*³³.
23. 'Umar encouraged people to emigrate, saying *hāğirū wa-lā tahağğarū*³⁴.
24. 'Umar spoke of the Muslims as divided into *muhāğirūn*, Anşār and bedouin. His *muhāğirūn* clearly included emigrants to garrison cities, not just those to the Prophet's Medina: they were "beneath the shades of swords", they and their families were to be paid their *fay*' in full, and they were not to be kept too long in the field (*lā tuğammarū*)³⁵.
25. Işo'yahb refers to the Muslims as *Mahgre* in a letter written not later than the mid-640's³⁶.
26. The Muslims appear as *Mahgre*, *mahgraye* in a Syriac account of a religious dispute set in 644³⁷.
27. Of Nu'mān b. 'Ubāda al-Bakrī we are told that he stayed in Fars, *wa-lam yakun hāğara ilā 'l-Başra*. Presumably this means that he had stayed on in Fars in 30/650, when Tawwağ ceased to be a *dār hiğra* and its troops were transferred to Basra³⁸.

³² A. Grohmann, «Aperçu de papyrologie arabe», *Etudes de Papyrologie* 1 (1932), pp. 41f (PERF 558, 643 A.D.); id. «Greek Papyri in the Early Islamic Period in the Collection of Archduke Rainer» *ibid.*, 8 (1957), pp. 28f (PERF 564, 642 A.D.); cf. H. and R. Kahane, «Die Magariten», *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 76 (1960).

³³ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2718. 2721,

³⁴ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2729f; Ibn Sa'd, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, ed. E. Sachau and others, Leiden 1904-21, vol. iii/1, p. 324. Compare W. Madelung, «Apocalyptic Prophecies in Ḥimş in the Umayyad Age», *Journal of Semitic Studies* 31 (1986), p. 178, where 'Umar encourage Yemenis to emigrate in an apocalyptic vein.

³⁵ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2775.

³⁶ Işo'yahb, *Liber Epistularum*, ed. and tr. R. Duval, Paris 1904-5, pp. 97 = 73. In the opinion of S.H. Griffith, «The Prophet Muḥammad, his Scripture and his Message according to the Christian Apologies in Arabic and Syriac from the First Abbasid Century», in *La vie du prophète Mahomet, Colloque de Strasbourg, octobre 1980*, Paris 1983, pp. 122f, the terms *Mahgre* and *Mahgraye* have nothing to do with *hiğra*, only with Hagar (but he is less categorical in note 3, and even less so in his «Free Will in Christian *Kalām*», *Le Muséon* 100 (1987), pp. 151ff).

³⁷ F. Nau, «Un colloque du Patriarche Jean avec l'émir des Agaréens», *Journal Asiatique*, 11th series, 5 (1915), pp. 248, 251f = 257, 260ff.

³⁸ Al-Balāğurī, *Ansāb al-aşraf*, vol. xi (= *Anonyme arabisches Chronik*) ed. A. Ahlwardt, Greifswald 1883, p. 149; cf. M. Hinds, «The First Arab Conquests in Fārs», *Iran* 22 (1984), pp. 45-7.

28. In 30/650f ʿUṭmān initiated a complex land exchanged in favour of Medinese participants in the conquest of Iraq who had decided to stay in Medina instead of making the *hiğra* to Iraq (*min ahl al-Madīna mimman aqāma wa-lam yakun yuhāğir ilā ʿl-ʿIrāq*)³⁹.
29. ʿUṭmān referred to the Syrians as *muhāğirūn* in *arḍ al-hiğra*⁴⁰.
30. In Kufa in the time of ʿUṭmān al-Aštar told an Asadī that “your people only converted because they were forced and only emigrated (*hāğarū*) because they were poor”⁴¹.
31. The poet Ḥakīm b. Qabīša b. ʿDirār al-Ḍabbī likewise told his son that “you have not emigrated for the sake of Paradise, but for the sake of bread and dates”⁴².
32. The poet Labīb b. Rabīʿa visited the Prophet, converted and returned to his people; then he *hāğara* to Kufa; after his death in 41/661 his sons returned *ilā ʿl-bādiya aʿrāban*⁴³.
33. At the time of Muʿāwiya’s accession the population of Mosul and the Ġazīra consisted of Kufans and Basrans who had abandoned their *hiğra*, so Muʿāwiya established the military district of Qinnasrīn for them (*mašsaraha wa-ğannadahā*)⁴⁴.
34. Muʿāwiya lorded it over *ğamāʿat al-muslimīn min al-Anṣār wa ʿl-muhāğirīn* in the year of his accession according to al-Ġāğiz⁴⁵. Apparently, there were no Muslims of other kinds (except perhaps bedouin, cf. above, no. 24).
35. The Muslims appear as *Mahgraye* in a Syriac colophon dated 63/682⁴⁶.
36. After the death of Yazīd I in 683, ʿUbaydallāh b. Ziyād tried to ingratiate himself with the Basrans by telling them that he had

³⁹ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2854.

⁴⁰ Ibn al-Mubārak, *Ğihād*, no. 194 (with parallels in the note thereto).

⁴¹ Al-Balāğurī, *Ansāb al-ašraf*, vol. v, ed. S.D.F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936, p. 45¹⁰; Ibn Aʿtam, *Kitāb al-futūḥ*, Hyderabad 1968-75, vol. ii, p. 192.

⁴² Abū Tammām, *Ĥamasae carmina cum Tebrisii scholiis*, ed. G. Freytag, Bonn 1828-51, p. 792.

⁴³ Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. vi, pp. 20f.

⁴⁴ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2673f.

⁴⁵ Al-Ġāğiz, ‘*Risāla fi banī Umayya*’ in his *Rasāʾil*, ed. Ḥ. al-Sandūbī, Cairo 1933, pp. 293f.

⁴⁶ W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London 1870, p. 92.

- been born among them and that his father had made his *hiğra* to them (*mā muhāğar abī illā ilaykum*)⁴⁷.
37. The Muslims also appear as *Mahgraye* in the works of Jacob of Edessa (d. 708) and other Syriac sources of the Umayyad period⁴⁸.
38. Tağlib in the Jazīra were bedouin; after the battle of Marğ Rāhiṭ, when they were feuding with Qays, they contacted their *muhāğirūn* in Azerbaijan⁴⁹.
39. The bedouin is distinguished from the *muhāğir* in a verse by the Tağlibī poet al-Quṭāmī⁵⁰.
40. The same distinction is made in a verse by the Ṭāʾī poet Iyās b. Mālik⁵¹.
41. Confronted with the Azāriqa at Dūlāb in 65/685, the governor of Basra promised any *mawla* who would join him the stipends of an Arab and any bedouin who would join him the stipends of a *muhāğir*⁵².
42. When al-Ĥağğāğ arrived as governor of Iraq in 75/694, he recited a verse by an anonymous Asadī poet with the line *muhāğir laysa bi-ʿarabi*⁵³.
- 42a. The father of the Ĥāriğite rebel Šabīb b. Yazīd was *min muhājirat al-Kūfa*. He had emigrated from Kufa to Mosul^{53a}.
43. A poem in praise of al-Muhallab attributed to Diʿbil says that the Basrans, threatened by the Azāriqa, “had decided to move to the bedouin, fearing that they might perish. They almost reached a state of extreme suffering, after nobility and after the *hiğra*”⁵⁴. In other words, they had decided to abandon their *hiğra* to Basra.

⁴⁷ Al-Ġāğiz, *al-Bayān wa ʿl-tabyīn*, ed. ʿA.-S.M. Hārūn, Cairo 1960-61, vol. ii, p. 130.

⁴⁸ Cf. the examples in P. Crone and M. Cook, *Hagarism, the Making of the Islamic World*, Cambridge 1977, pp. 11, 164³⁵, 173³⁰, 213¹.

⁴⁹ *Āğānī*, vol. xii, p. 205.

⁵⁰ Al-Quṭāmī, *Diwān*, ed. J. Barth, Leiden 1902, no. IV:25.

⁵¹ Abū Tammām, *Ĥamasa*, p. 294.

⁵² *Āğānī*, vol. viii, p. 417.

⁵³ Ġāğiz, *Bayān*, vol. ii, p. 309, top. For other attestations, see Rubin, ‘*Hiğra and Muhāğirūn*’, note 15.

^{53a} Ibn Ḥazm, *Ğamharat ansāb al-ʿArab*, ed. ʿA.-S. Hārūn, Cairo 1962, p. 327; cf. P. Crone, ‘Were the Qays and the Yemen Political Parties’, forthcoming in *Der Islam* 71, p. 39.

⁵⁴ Al-ʿAwtabī, *al-Ansāb*, Oman (*wizārat al-turāṭ al-qawmī*) 1984, vol. ii, p. 138 = M. Hinds (tr.), *An Early Islamic Family from Oman: al-ʿAwtabī’s Account of the Muhallabids*, Manchester 1991, p. 45, §50.

44. In the Greek papyri issued by Qurra b. Šarīk al-ʿAbsī, governor of Egypt 709-14 AD, and others, the Muslim soldiers appear as *Mōagaritai* and *mauleis/mauloi*⁵⁵.

45. In a story set between 93/712 and 95/714 Muqātil b. Ḥayyān relates how he abandoned his position as judge in Samarqand, went to Buḥārā and emigrated (*hiğrat kardam*) from there to Marw⁵⁶.

46. Some Isfahānīs in Basra were said to owe their presence there to conversion and emigration (*aslamū wa-ḥāğarū*)⁵⁷.

47. The misdeeds of the Umayyads, according to al-Ğāḥiğ, included their habit of returning (non-Arab) converts to their villages *baʿda ʿl-hiğra*⁵⁸.

48. In his fiscal edict ʿUmar II declared himself obliged to “open the gate of *hiğra* for the people of Islam”. He continues: “As for Islam....whoever accepts Islam, whether Christian or Jew or Zoroastrian....and joins himself to the body of Muslims in their abode, and who forsakes the abode wherein he was before, he shall have the same rights and duties as the Muslims.....As for emigration (*hiğra*), we open it up to whoever may emigrate of the bedouin and who sells his cattle and transfers from his bedouin abode to the abode of emigration (*dār al-hiğra*), to warfare against our enemy. Whoever does that shall have an equal share with the Muhāğirūn in that which God has given them of booty”⁵⁹.

49. Ğabhāʿ, a bedouin poet of the Umayyads period, was told by his wife that “it would be best for you if you were to emigrate (*ḥāğarta*) to Medina, sell your camel and enroll for stipends (*iftarađta fī ʿl-ʿaṭāʿ*)”⁶⁰.

50. In 109/727 Asad al-Qasrī, the governor of Ḥurāsān, made a speech in which he asked God to take him back to his *muhāğar* and *waṭan*, presumably meaning Syria⁶¹.

⁵⁵ H.I. Bell (ed.), *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. iv (*The Aphrodito Papyri*), London 1910, index, s.vv. “*mōagaritēs” (over 50 attestations), “*mauleus”, and p. xxxiv; cf. also R. Rémondon, *Papyrus grecs d’Apollōnos Anō* (Documents de fouilles de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire XIX), Cairo 1953, p. 12.

⁵⁶ Balḥī, *Fađāʿil-i Balḥ*, ed. ʿA.-H. Ḥabībī, Tehran 1350, p. 79.

⁵⁷ Balāğurī, *Futūḥ*, p. 366.

⁵⁸ Ğāḥiğ, ‘Risāla fī banī Umayya’, p. 297.

⁵⁹ Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz*, ed. A. ʿUbayd, fifth printing, Damascus 1967, pp. 94f = H.A.R. Gibb (tr.), ‘The Fiscal Rescript of ʿUmar II’, *Arabica* 2 (1955), pp. 2f.

⁶⁰ *Ağānī*, vol. xviii, p. 95.

⁶¹ Ṭabarī, ser. ii. p. 1498.

51. Al-Ḥašan, presumably al-Bašrī (d. 110/728), held that “the *hiğra* of the bedouin (is effected) when they join their *dīwān*”. Al-Šaybānī explains that “*hiğra* was a duty in the beginning”, and al-Saraḥsī adds that “it is part of al-Ḥašan’s doctrine that he did not consider this rule to have been abrogated and that a bedouin who converts must (in his view) inscribe his name in the *dīwān al-ğuzāt* in order to become a *muhāğir*, the purpose of *hiğra* being warfare in those days”⁶².

52. Bilāl b. Abī Burda al-Ašʿarī, deputy for Ḥālid al-Qasrī in Basra until 120/738, reminded a Tamīmī that Ḥira was his *dār aʿrabiyya* and Basra his *dār hiğra*⁶³.

53. ʿUmayr b. Hānīʿ al-ʿAnsī, a member of Yazīd III’s Yamaniyya, encouraged people to pay allegiance to Yazīd, saying that “there are only two *hiğras*, the *hiğra* to God and His Messenger and the *hiğra* to Yazīd”⁶⁴.

54. The Farāḥīd had their homes (*manāzil*) in Oman and their *muhāğar* in Mosul; the Ḥimām had their homes in Oman and their *muhāğar* in Mosul and Basra, as we are told *sub anno* 129/746-7⁶⁵.

55. Emigrants from the Yemen to Ḥimṣ are referred to as *muhāğirūn*, and Syria as their *muhāğar*, in apocalyptic prophecies dating from the Umayyad and early Abbasid periods; here too emigrants are contrasted with bedouin⁶⁶.

56. In a letter to Ibrāḥīm b. ʿUbaydallāḥ al-Ḥağabī, governor of the Yemen for Hārūn al-Rašīd (786-809 AD), the Yemeni writer Bišr b. Abī Kubār al-Balawī says that “The *amīr*, may God preserve him, knows how long I have loved and respected him, and that I have emigrated with him (*wa-hiğratī maʿahu*), and that I am one of those who ‘spent and fought before the victory’ (cf. Qur. 57:9/10), and further that I have not reverted to bedouinism after emigrating (*innī lam ataʿarrab baʿda ʿl-hiğra*)”⁶⁷.

⁶² Saraḥsī, *Šarḥ*, p. 94. Cf. also below, note 131.

⁶³ Athamina, ‘Aʿrāb and Muhājirūn’, p. 10, note 33, citing Balāğurī, *Ansāb*, MS, fol. 737b; cf. C. Pellat, *Le milieu Bašrien et la formation de Ğāḥiğ*, Paris 1953, index s.v. ‘Bilāl b. Abī Burda’.

⁶⁴ Al-Dahabī, *Mizān al-iʿtidāl*, ed. ʿA.M. al-Biğāwī, Cairo 1963, vol. iii, p. 297; cf. J. van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra*, Berlin and New York 1991-, vol. i, p. 94.

⁶⁵ Al-Azdī, *Taʿrīḥ al-Mawṣil*, ed. ʿA. Ḥabība, Cairo 1967, pp. 93, 96.

⁶⁶ Madelung, ‘Apocalyptic Prophecies’, pp. 153, 162f, 166f, 169; cf. id., ‘Hijra’, p. 233.

⁶⁷ W. al-Qādī (ed.), *Bišr b. Abī Kubār al-Balawī*, Beirut 1985, pp. 175f.

The concept of *hiġra* in these passages conforms to that of the Qurʾān in that it is closely associated with warfare. A *dār al-hiġra* is a military centre (*manzil ġihād, qayrawān, miṣr* and *ġund*, cf. nos. 11, 33); and a *muhāġir* is a resident of such a centre, where he is registered as a soldier and receives stipends from the proceeds of the immovable spoils of war known as *fayʿ* (nos. 5, 17, 24, 41, 48, 51). Unlike the Qurʾān, the first-century material never envisages *hiġra* as a response to persecution; and despite the Qurʾānic inclusion of 'poor Muhāġirūn' among the recipients of booty bestowed by God on His Messenger (Q. 59:6f/7f), the stress on the fiscal entitlements of the *muhāġir* is new; so too is the contrast between *muhāġirūn* and bedouin (nos. 5, 24, 32, 38-43, 48, 51, 52, 55, 56; cf. also 17, 49) and between the former and *mawālī* (nos. 41, 44, cf. also 48). But these changes are not problematic.

Such persecutions as the Muslims may have suffered obviously came to an end when they gained the upper hand in Arabia. They continue to emigrate in order to fight holy war, however, and the conquests resulted in the acquisitions of massive tracts of land which might have been distributed among the actual conquerors, but which 'Umar decided to keep in public ownership as so-called *fayʿ*, rewarding the conquerors by paying them stipends out of the tax income instead: the conquerors could then be kept together as soldiers in garrison cities instead of dispersing (and ultimately disappearing) as landlords and peasants among the conquered peoples. This raised questions about precisely who was entitled to a share. In Umayyad practice it is clear that emigration to a garrison city and regular service there were normally required for a stipend, and this view is attributed to 'Umar too: "the *fayʿ* belongs to the inhabitants of these garrison cities and those who join them, help them and stay among them", he is reputed to have announced when he instituted the *dīwān*⁶⁸; "he who hurries to *hiġra* hurries to stipends", as he is also said to have put it⁶⁹ (though he is credited with the alternative view as well⁷⁰). An emigrant thus came to be identified as a person endowed with fiscal rights which bedouin and

⁶⁸ Ṭabarī, ser. i. p. 2414.

⁶⁹ Abū 'Ubayd, *Amwāl*, p. 319, no. 547 (*man asra'a ilā al-hiġra asra'a bihi al-'atā'*); Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. iii, p. 475. 2 up (likewise).

⁷⁰ 'Umar held that all Muslims (not just soldiers in garrison cities) were entitled to a share in the *fayʿ*, except for slaves (Yaḥyā b. Ādam, *Kitāb al-ḥarāġ*, ed. Th.W. Juynboll, Leiden 1896, p. 6; similarly Abū 'Ubayd, *Amwāl*, p. 304, end of no. 523).

non-Arabs lacked; for the former had not emigrated and thus could not claim a share in the *fayʿ*; and though the latter might well have converted and emigrated to a garrison city, they were equally unable to claim a share in the spoils of conquests because they (or their ancestors) had fought on the wrong side: both were accordingly paid less than emigrants for such military services as they might perform (no. 41).

Some would grant non-Arab Muslims the same rights as emigrants (nos. 5, 48), and the distinction between Arab and non-Arab soldiers had largely disappeared by the late Umayyad period, but few seem to have been willing actually to count non-Arab Muslims as emigrants: as Qurra b. Šarīk's papyri distinguish between *muhāġirūn* and *mawālī* (no. 44), so 'Umar II distinguishes between the *hiġra* of bedouin and the mere *firāq* of non-Arab converts (no. 48), while the Prophetic tradition refers to the latter's emigration as simple *taḥawwul* (no. 5; contrast the otherwise similar offer to the Arab Ḥīrans in no. 6). By the ninth century, authors such as al-Balāḍurī and al-Ġāḥiẓ unselfconsciously thought of non-Arab converts who emigrated to garrison cities as *muhāġirūn* (nos. 46, 47); many others must have called their emigration a *hiġra* too, for in Iran making a *hiġra* apparently came to mean no more than moving to the provincial capital⁷¹, while the tenth-century Qāḍī al-Nu'cman held every convert to be a *muhāġir*, now in the spiritual sense of someone who has made a mental journey to God and His Prophet⁷². But first-century Muslims apparently saw *hiġra* as an act which only Arabs could perform. Whether this reflects an allusion, in the word *muhāġir*, to descent from Hagar is a question which need not detain us here⁷³.

All the above developments, however, turn on the fact that the concept of *hiġra* now included emigration to military centres outside Arabia, and the question is how this wider meaning of the term is

⁷¹ Cf. the list, no. 45. Muqātil b. Ḥayyān was already a *muhāġir*, in so far as non-Arabs could be thus described: he did not go to Marw in order to convert and join the army or other institutions of government, being a Muslim and government employee before he set out.

⁷² Al-Nu'cman b. Muḥammad, *Da'ā'im al-islām*, ed. 'A.A. al-Fayḍī, Cairo 1951-60, vol. ii, no. 1194 (*man daḥala fī 'l-islām taḥawwān fa-huwa muhāġir*). Note also that Abū 'Ubayd has no qualms about glossing the *yataḥawwalū* of the Prophetic tradition cited in no. 5 as *yuhāġirū* (*Amwāl*, p. 304, no. 523).

⁷³ Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, pp. 8f. Non-Muslims, on the other hand, had no compunction about labelling converts Mahgraye (cf. *ibid.*, p. 160³⁷).

to be explained. It is in answer to this question that Madelung proposes reinterpretation by ʿUmar. ʿUmar does indeed figure prominently in the above list; and though the non-classical use of the word is also attested before his caliphate (nos. 1-7), this could (and in several cases clearly must) be dismissed as back-projection. It was ʿUmar who gave orders for the establishment of garrison towns, who decided not to distribute the conquered lands among the conquerors, who set up the *dīwāns* for the payment of stipends and who ruled (or is said to have ruled) that only *muhāğirūn* were entitled to a share. It would thus seem reasonable to infer that the very notion of *hiğra* to garrison cities was ʿUmar's brainchild too.

But why do we take it for granted that the concept of emigration had to be *changed* in order to include movement to military centres outside Arabia? Given that ʿUmar and the Prophet were contemporaries, and indeed intimate associates, the presumption must surely be that they operated with the same concept of emigration. This presumption may strike us as odd because we all think of *hiğra* (or rather the 'real' as opposed to the Ethiopian *hiğra*) as a process which began in 622 and came to an end in 630, when Mecca was conquered, or as a single event of 622, so that any *hiğra* encountered therefore must be a reinterpretation or re-enactment of the original idea; but we owe this line of thought to the tradition, not to the Qurʾān. The Qurʾān nowhere states that emigration must go to a particular place, be it in Arabia or elsewhere, in order to count as *hiğra*. On the contrary, it seems to suggest the opposite: "whoso emigrates in the way of God will find in the earth *muğāraman kağīran*" (Q. 4:99/101). It does convey the impression that Muḥammad had a single centre in Arabia, and we may accept that this centre was Yatrib; but since the Qurʾān never reveals its identity, it would be difficult to present Yatrib as intrinsic to the Qurʾānic concept of emigration. Nor does the Qurʾān present the duty of *hiğra* as finite; on the contrary, *hiğra* and holy war are linked with such regularity that one would assume them to stand and fall together. Holy war remained a duty far beyond the lifetime of the Prophet, and we now find that the same is true of *hiğra*. Why then assume that ʿUmar reinterpreted the concept? The *prima facie* reading of the evidence is that he simply continued it.

Here as so often, our perspective is skewed by classical conceptions, for we tacitly accept with our sources that the Prophet's incomparability places him in a category of his own: *hiğra* in his

time was one thing, *hiğra* thereafter something else. Obviously, if *hiğra* in the time of the Prophet was a unique process—*Hiğra* with a capital H—then all later emigration must be imitation and/or reinterpretation of the original idea; but what the continued use of the notion of *hiğra* suggests is precisely that this view of things is secondary. Like the Qurʾānic concept, that which prevailed in the first century and a half was open-ended: Medina was Muḥammad's abode of emigration, but emigration continued to both this and other abodes of emigration after his death: one could still engage in *hiğra* to Medina in the time of ʿUmar and the Umayyads (nos. 15, 49); one could make a *hiğra* away from Medina too (nos. 15, 28), to one of the centres outside Arabia (a movement which later authors would describe as mere *taḥawwul*⁷⁴); and one could abandon one's *hiğra* in any of these centres by engaging in the reprehensible act of *taʿarrub baʿda ʿl-hiğra*. One abandoned one's *hiğra* by becoming a bedouin or a peasant as opposed to remaining a soldier wherever one happened to be inscribed⁷⁵, not just by leaving Medina, for a *dār al-hiğra* was simply an armed camp or mobilization centre to which one went to fight the infidels whoever and wherever they might be. There is no sense in this material of an original *hiğra* with a capital 'H' verses an imitative one of less importance. All Arabs in all garrison cities are Muhāğirūn, be they in Arabia or elsewhere, and all are unselfconsciously referred to as such in official documents, poetry, incidental remarks and by their non-Muslim subjects.

If Muḥammad operated with a closed concept of *hiğra* for eight years and ʿUmar introduced the open-ended version which predominated for the next hundred years, one wonders how the original concept survived: for once all emigrants to garrison cities had come to be known as Muhāğirūn, the emigrants to Muḥammad's Medina can hardly have been distinguished from everyone else by that very title, and one would have expected the cheap currency to drive out the expensive variety. By contrast, it is easy to see how the closed concept could have driven out the open-ended one, given that the obligation to live as a Muhāğir in a mobilization centre lost relevance in the course of the Umayyad period, whereas

⁷⁴ Cf. Ibn Saʿd, *Tabaqāt*, ser. i. p. 13: ʿAbdallāh b. Abī ʿAwfā al-Aslamī *taḥawwala* from Medina to Kufa.

⁷⁵ Cf. F. Løkkegaard, *Islamic Taxation in the Classic Period*, Copenhagen 1950, pp. 82f; Kister, «Land Property and Jihad», pp. 279f.

the Qur'ānic references to emigrants in Muḥammad's time ensured that the earliest Muhāğirūn would be remembered even if the original use of the term was forgotten. In other words, the open-ended concept must have been the first. What the evidence suggests is not that 'Umar reinterpreted the concept of *hiğra* to include emigration to garrison cities, but on the contrary that later generations reinterpreted it so as to exclude it.

The emergence of the classical concept

If this is correct, how and when did the classical concept emerge? We may start by surveying the material in which the open-ended concept of *hiğra* is under attack. It falls into three groups.

First, numerous traditions present Muḥammad as exempting individuals and tribal groups from the duty of *hiğra*, or abolishing it altogether, before the conquest of Mecca, or without reference to it. Thus he allowed Salama b. al-Akwa' al-Aslamī to live in the desert when he asked for permission to do so⁷⁶; alternatively, he exempted the entire bedouin section of Aslam from the duty of emigration in a letter stating that "they are Muhāğirūn wherever they are"⁷⁷; or he exempted the Aslamī emigrants in Medina, saying "inhabit the ravines/dwell in the desert, O Aslam ... you are Muhāğirūn wherever you are"⁷⁸. Ibn 'Umar held Aslam to be the

⁷⁶ Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. iv/2, p. 39.

⁷⁷ Ibn Sa'd *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. i/2, p. 24 = J. Wellhausen (tr.), «Ibn Sa'd, die Schreiben Muhammads und die Gesandtschaften an ihn» in his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vol. iv, Berlin 1889, p. 113, no. 29. (There is no reference to *hiğra* in connection with the settled section.) Similarly Wāqidī, *Mağāzī*, vol. ii, p. 782, where the Prophet makes the statement orally rather than in writing in response to a comment by Burayda b. al-Ḥaṣīb. For a different interpretation of this and other exemptions from the duty of *hiğra*, see A. Cheikh-Moussa and D. Gazagnadou, «Comment on écrit l'histoire.... de l'Islam», *Arabica* 40 (1993), pp. 228ff.

⁷⁸ Thus according to Salama b. al-Akwa', who invoked the Prophet's collective exemption of Aslam when he was accused of *irtidād* 'an al-*hiğra* by Burayda b. al-Ḥaṣīb al-Aslamī and whose version presents the Aslamīs as emigrants in Medina by making them express fear of committing that very sin (Abū 'Ubayd, *Amwāl*, p. 314, no. 539; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. iii, pp. 361f; iv, 55.5; Hayṭamī, *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, pp. 253f). According to other versions, Salama merely invoked his personal dispensation when he was accused of undoing his *hiğra* (see the references given below, note 145; the accuser is here al-Ḥağğāğ); and still others have it that he only left Medina when 'Utmān was killed, not in the time of the Prophet (al-Buḥārī, *al-Sahīḥ*, ed. L. Krehl and T.W. Juynboll, Leiden 1862-1908, vol. iv, p. 373).

only Muslims to be allowed to live in the desert⁷⁹, but the classical tradition knows of many more. Thus the Prophet is said to have written to B. 'Amr of Ḥuzā'a that "I give those of you who emigrate the same rights as I have myself, even if they emigrate in their own land"⁸⁰. When four hundred men of Muzayna came to Medina in 5/626, the Prophet *ğā'ala lahum al-*hiğra* fi dārihim*, telling them that "you are Muhāğirūn wherever you are"⁸¹. Three 'Absīs had heard from their *qurrā'* that one could not be a Muslim without emigrating (*lā islām li-man lā hiğrata lahu*), but the Prophet assured them that this was not so: "fear God wherever you are; God would not defraud you of ought of your deeds (cf. Qur. 52:20/21) even if you lived in al-Ḍamad and Ğāzān"⁸². A man desirous of *ğihād* and *hiğra*, but endowed with property that needed his presence, was similarly reassured that God would not defraud him of ought of his deeds even if he lived in al-Ḍamad and Ğāzān⁸³, while another was told that it would not harm him to live in the vicinity of al-Ḍamad of Ğāzān⁸⁴. A certain Fudayk had heard that he who does not emigrate will perish (*man lam yuhāğir halaka*), but the Prophet told him to pray, pay *zakāt*, shun evil and to live among his people wherever he wanted⁸⁵. Šaddād b. Asīd al-Sulamī fell ill in Medina, but did not want to leave for a more salubrious place because he did not want to undo his *hiğra*, but the Prophet told him to go, "for you are a Muhāğir wherever you are"⁸⁶. Others were exempted from the duty of emigration to Medina by swearing allegiance to Muḥammad on *hiğrat al-bādiya/al-bādī* or *bay'at al-ʿarabiyya*, as

⁷⁹ Rubin, «Hiğra», note 105, citing Hayṭamī, *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, p. 254-9.

⁸⁰ Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. i/2, p. 25 = Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vol. iv, pp. 114f, no. 32; Wāqidī, *Mağāzī*, vol. ii, pp. 749f.

⁸¹ Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. i/2, p. 38 = Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vol. iv, pp. 135f, no. 76.

⁸² Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. i/2, p. 42 = Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vol. iv, p. 140, no. 79, where the names are corrupt. Al-Ḍamad and Ğāzān were places between Yemen and Mecca (Yāqūt, *Muṣjam al-buldān*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Leipzig 1866-73, s.vv, citing the 'Absī tradition s.v. 'al-Ḍamad').

⁸³ Yaḥyā b. Ādam, *Ḥarāğ*, p. 59.

⁸⁴ Yāqūt, *Buldān*, s.v. 'al-Ḍamad'.

⁸⁵ Abū 'Ubayd, *Amwāl*, p. 311, no. 534; Hayṭamī, *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, p. 255, middle.

⁸⁶ Rubin, «Hiğra», note 109, citing *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, p. 254, and other sources.

opposed to *hiğrat al-bāttal/al-hādīr* or *bayʿat al-hiğra*⁸⁷. Some bedouin were positively advised by the Prophet to stay by their camels on the grounds that one could do good works “even across the seas”⁸⁸. There was no duty to emigrate physically at all: “If you perform the prayer and pay the alms, you are a Muhāğir even if you die in al-Ḥaḍar/al-Ḥaḍrama/al-Ḥaḍramawt”, an anonymous bedouin was told⁸⁹; “the earth is God’s and the worshippers are God’s, so wherever one of you finds it good to live, there let him fear God and stay”, the Prophet said on another occasion⁹⁰. A *muhāğir* was not someone who emigrated physically, but rather someone who shunned what God has forbidden, as several Prophetic traditions inform us, invoking the root meaning of *hğr*⁹¹, or someone who abandoned polytheism (i.e. a convert)⁹². Just as the best *ğihād* is prayer, so shunning sins is the best *hiğra*⁹³. Or *hiğra* is a morally neutral act which acquires its meaning from intention: for just as the emigrant may turn to God and his Apostle, so he may turn to things of this world, depending on what his *niyya* is⁹⁴.

Secondly, a number of traditions tell us that the Prophet formally abolished the duty of *hiğra* when he conquered Mecca, or that the

⁸⁷ Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, p. 313, no. 537; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. ii, pp. 160.3, 191.12, 193.12, 195.10 (ed. Šākir, vol. viii, no. 6487; vol. ix, nos. 6792, 6813; vol. ix, no. 6837); al-Nasāʿī, *al-Sunan*, with the commentary of al-Suyūṭī and the supercommentary of al-Sindī, Cairo 1987, vol. vii, p. 144; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. iv/2, p. 66; Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 252; Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, notes 110-11, 116, citing these and other sources.

⁸⁸ Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, vol. iii, no. 2477; Nasāʿī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 144 and the commentaries thereto; other references in Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, note 117.

⁸⁹ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. xi, no. 6890; vol. xii, no. 7095; Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, pp. 253f; Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, note 122, with yet another reference.

⁹⁰ Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 255, middle (first noted by Rubin).

⁹¹ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. x, no. 6515; vol. xi, no. 6806, 6814, 6925, 7017, etc. (see the subject index s.v. ‘al-hiğra’); vol. xii, no. 7086; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, vol. iii, no. 2481; al-Ṭahāwī, *Muškīl al-āṭār*, Hyderabad 1333, vol. iii, p. 259f (who also invokes Fudayk, cf. above, note 85); Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, notes 123, 125, citing other sources.

⁹² Nasāʿī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 144f, where both ʿUmar and Abū Bakr on the one hand and the Anṣār on the other are *muhāğirūn* in this sense; compare above, note 72.

⁹³ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. viii, no. 6487; vol. xi, nos. 6792, 6813 (all of which proceed to discuss *hiğra* in the literal sense); Ibn Ḥağar, *Iṣāba*, vol. iv, p. 832, s.v. ‘Umm Anas *zawğ* Abī Anas’.

⁹⁴ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. i, no. 168; Buḥārī, *Šaḥīḥ*, vol. iii, p. 35.

duty came to an end when he died⁹⁵. The former idea is by far the best attested. “Stay in your residences, for the duty of *hiğra* has come to an end; but *ğihād* and intention continue”, he proclaimed on the conquest of Mecca according to one version⁹⁶. “There is no *hiğra* after the conquest (of Mecca), only *ğihād* and intention”, as the classical *lā hiğra* tradition has him say⁹⁷. Practically all versions are careful to point out that holy war continues, and many add that people should respond when they are called up. Other traditions show us the new dispensation in action. Thus Muğāšīʿ b. Masʿūd al-Sulamī told the Prophet that he and his brother (or nephew) wished to pay him allegiance *ʿalā ʿl-hiğra*, to which the Prophet replied that there was no *hiğra* any more, but that they could swear allegiance on Islam and holy war⁹⁸. Murra b. Wahb al-Ṭaqafī and his son Yaʿlā received much the same reply⁹⁹. Šafwān b. Umayya and other Meccans who wished to emigrate to Medina after the conquest returned to Mecca because the *hiğra* had been closed¹⁰⁰. And when Muğāhid wished to emigrate to Syria, Ibn ʿUmar replied that “there is no *hiğra* (any more), but there is *ğihād*, so go and offer yourself”, assuring him that he was free to return if he wished¹⁰¹.

Thirdly, a small number of counter-traditions argue against the above material by having the Prophet declare that “the duty of

⁹⁵ This view is sponsored in an Iraqi tradition attributed to ʿUmar (Nasāʿī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 146.6; first noted by M. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, Cambridge 1981, p. 101); it is rejected in the tradition referred to below, note 110.

⁹⁶ Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, p. 311, no. 532.

⁹⁷ Ibn Abī Šayba, *Muṣannaf*, vol. xiv, nos. 18776-8; ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, vol. v, nos. 9711-13; Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, p. 311, no. 533; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. iii, no. 1991; vol. iv, no. 2396; vol. xi, no. 7012; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, vol. iii, no. 2480; Buḥārī, *Šaḥīḥ*, vol. ii, p. 267; Nasāʿī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 146; and so on. There is also a version which has *al-īmān wa-l-niyya* (Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 250, 4 up).

⁹⁸ Ibn Abī Šayba, *Muṣannaf*, vol. xiv, no. 18779; Buḥārī, *Šaḥīḥ*, vol. iii, pp. 145f (*mağāzī*; adds faith); Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. viii/1, p. 19; Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 250 (slightly different); Ṭahāwī, *Muškīl*, vol. iii, pp. 252f, 253f (several versions); further references in Ğūda, *al-ʿArab*, p. 228, note 3; Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, note 136.

⁹⁹ Ibn Abī Šayba, *Muṣannaf*, vol. xiv, no. 18777; Nasāʿī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 145; Ṭahāwī, *Muškīl*, vol. iii, p. 253; further references in Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, note 137.

¹⁰⁰ al-Balāḍurī, *Ansāb al-ašraf*, vol. i, ed. M. Ḥamīdullāh, Cairo 1959, pp. 262f; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. iii, pp. 430f; Ṭahāwī, *Muškīl*, vol. iii, pp. 253, 254f; Hayṭamī, *Mağmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 250, middle; Rubin, ‘Hiğra’, notes 138, 169.

¹⁰¹ Buḥārī, *Šaḥīḥ*, vol. iii, p. 146.

hiğra will not come to an end as long as infidels are fought”, or “as long as *ğihād* continues”¹⁰². “*Hiğra* will not come to an end until repentance does, and repentance will not come to an end until the sun rises in the west”, Mu‘āwiya cites him as saying¹⁰³.

Group 1

What then can we make of this material? Modern scholars generally accept the traditions of group 1, or some of them, at face value and infer that Muḥammad relaxed and eventually abolished the duty of *hiğra* because Medina was becoming overcrowded: “There seems to have been...a definite policy of requiring Muslims to be—or to become—settled people. As the number of converts from nomadic groups rose, however, this policy became increasingly difficult to implement”, Donner says¹⁰⁴; “As the conversions to Islam increased throughout Arabia, the duty of emigration to Medina no doubt became more and more unrealistic and was, if not formally abolished as the Meccan and Medinese traditions affirmed, left in abeyance”, as Madelung puts it¹⁰⁵. But this interpretation is difficult to accept.

In the first place, is there not something implausible about the idea that the Prophet should have abandoned the duty of *hiğra* because Medina was filling up? If one abode of emigration was getting overcrowded, the obvious response would surely have been to set up another. When the bedouin of twentieth-century Arabia were fired by the idea of settling as holy warriors, they established a plurality of *huğar*, not just a single one, and the Muslims of seventh-century Arabia can hardly have been so witless as to aban-

¹⁰² Abū ‘Ubayd, *Amwāl*, p. 312, no. 537; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. iv, p. 62, 7 up; Ṭahāwī, *Muškil*, vol. iii, pp. 257f; Hayṭamī, *Mağma‘ al-zawā‘id*, vol. v, pp. 250f; Nasā‘ī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, pp. 146f; cf. Madelung, «Hijra», pp. 227f.

¹⁰³ Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, vol. iii, no. 2479; Dārimī, *Sunan*, vol. ii, pp. 239f; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. iii, no. 1671; Nasā‘ī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, pp. 146f; Hayṭamī, *Mağma‘ al-zawā‘id*, vol. v, pp. 250f; cf. also Madelung, «Hijra», p. 227; Rubin, «Hijra», note 143. This tradition was often understood as being about spiritual *hiğra*.

¹⁰⁴ F.M. Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests*, Princeton 1981, p. 80.

¹⁰⁵ Madelung, «Hijra», p. 232. Madelung only takes some of the traditions to reflect developments in the Prophet’s time; others in his view reflect the desire of Yemeni Ḥimšīs of the Umayyad period to discourage bedouin immigration, but it is not easy to see how he discerns the difference.

don a policy of sedentarization and/or recruitment on the unsurprising discovery that not all the inhabitants of Arabia could be accommodated in a single town¹⁰⁶. If recruits continued to be needed, as they clearly did, one would have expected new abodes of *hiğra* to be established, and so indeed they were. It merely so happens that the new *dūr al-hiğra* (cf. above, no. 17) were established by caliphs rather than the Prophet, in Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Iran rather than in Arabia, and that this causes us automatically to classify the new foundations as wholly different from the first. But we should not see early Islamic history through classical eyes.

In the second place, the material is inconsistent¹⁰⁷, and moreover so didactic in tone as to leave no doubt that it is using history to make doctrinal points. Many traditions, for example, go out of their way to get their message across by first having the bedouin expound the view to be refuted, whereupon the Prophet explains the true position: “our *qurrā* say that there is no Islam for whoever does not emigrate”¹⁰⁸, “Oh Messenger of God, we are afraid of apostatizing after having emigrated”¹⁰⁹, “Oh Messenger of God, where should I make the *hiğra*? To you wherever I am, or to a particular land or a particular people? And will it be cut off when you

¹⁰⁶ In Donner’s view, the policy of sedentarization was not abandoned; rather, the bedouin were allowed to settle in their own land instead of Medina, this being the meaning of *hiğra fi dārihim* (*Conquests*, pp. 79f). But the traditions make it abundantly clear that bedouin who were allowed to ‘emigrate in their own homes’ were thereby allowed to remain bedouin.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. the information on Aslam. If the entire tribe, or its bedouin members, had been granted status as emigrants regardless of their whereabouts, why did Salama need personal permission to live in the desert? And if he only left when ‘Uṭmān was killed, how can he have asked for permission to leave in the days of the Prophet? (Cf. above, notes 76-8) Rubin’s answer to the first question is that Salama represents Aslam at large in the story of his individual permission (‘Hijra’, note 104); but the formulation does not suggest as much and the contexts do not tally: the letter in which the Prophet exempts all bedouin Aslamīs from the duty to emigrate is addressed to Aslam in their own land, whereas Salama depicts the Aslam who received collective dispensation as emigrants in Medina. If moreover all Aslam, or their bedouin members, had been dispensed from the duty to emigrate one way or the other, how could an eminent Aslami Companion such as Burayda b. al-Ḥaṣīb be unaware of it? (cf. above, note 78). If Burayda was unaware of it, how can the Prophet have issued the dispensation in his presence? (cf. above, note 77). And if all and sundry individuals and tribes had received dispensation too, how could Ibn ‘Umar think that Aslam were unique (note 79)?

¹⁰⁸ Ibn Sa‘d, above, note 82.

¹⁰⁹ Ibn Ḥanbal in note 78 above.

die?"¹¹⁰, the bedouin ever so innocently ask, whereupon the Prophet explains that they can be emigrants wherever they are. The traditions of group 2 and 3 also take that form at times: "Oh Messenger of God, they say that only emigrants will enter Paradise", Šafwān b. Umayya asks, to be reassured by the Prophet that there is no *hiğra* after the *fath*; "Oh Messenger of God...they claim that *hiğra* has come to an end", a Sa'dī says, to be reassured by the Prophet that *hiğra* will continue as long as infidels are fought¹¹¹. The material clearly reflects a debate, not developments in the thought of an individual.

In the third place, the traditions are dominated by the dichotomy between emigrants and bedouin which was commonplace in the Umayyad period, but hardly in Muḥammad's time. The Qur'ān does of course denounce the bedouin as fickle, but not with reference to their unwillingness to emigrate, which it does not mention at all¹¹²; and though it prohibits social relations (*walāya*) with those who have not emigrated (Q. 8:71/73; cf. 4:88/91), it neither says nor implies that non-emigrants were bedouin, as opposed to settled Arabs or a mixture of both.

In historical fact, Muḥammad must have been as eager to recruit settled people as bedouin, or more so, and settled Arabs can hardly have found it any easier to emigrate than bedouin, tied as they were to their land. One would accordingly have expected the tradition to pay much attention to their problems, but it does not. It knows of a settled Arab who sold his land in order to emigrate to Medina¹¹³, and it assures another (clearly as *pars pro toto*) that emigration was not necessary for salvation¹¹⁴; but for the most part it simply allows

¹¹⁰ Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. xi, no. 6890; vol. xii, no. 7095; Haytamī, *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, pp. 252f. Šākir reads the second question *ilayka ḥayṭumā kunta*, "to you wherever you [Muḥammad] are", whereas Rubin translates "wherever I am"; since the answer is that people are emigrants unto God and His Messenger wherever they are, Rubin's reading seems preferable. Šākir reads the final question *idā mutta inqata'at*, "will it come to an end when you die?", whereas Rubin translates "will it be annulled when I die?"; and here it is Šākir's version that must be right (cf. above, note 95). In other words, the tradition affirms that the duty of *hiğra* will go on for ever, but only in a spiritual sense.

¹¹¹ Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, pp. 146.1 and ult.; also 147.4; cf. above, notes 100, 102.

¹¹² Pace Madelung, «Hijra», pp. 229f.

¹¹³ Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1/2, p. 55, on 'Abdallāh b. Aswad al-Sadūsī.

¹¹⁴ Yahyā b. Adam, above, note 83.

settled groups to stay where they were by having the Prophet write them letters in which the duty of *hiğra* is tacitly replaced by that of separation from infidels (*firaq al-mušrikīn*), or in which neither separation nor emigration is mentioned at all, so that one is in danger of forgetting that the duty of emigration had ever applied to settled people¹¹⁵. By contrast, the tradition offers an abundance of stories about bedouin making the *hiğra* to Medina, their dislike of being there, their merit in having come, their accursedness in going back, their permission to go back, their exemption from the duty to come and so on, as if *hiğra* invariably involved a transition from bedouin to urban life¹¹⁶. It is for this reason that Donner interprets the duty of *hiğra* in the Prophet's time as a duty to settle¹¹⁷, a view that Rubin is close to espousing too¹¹⁸; but it seems more natural to infer that the material reflects later conditions.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1/2, pp. 15ff = Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vol. iv, pp. 97ff. That many of these letters were addressed to wholly or partly settled tribes is clear from the nature of the property they discuss. Not one requires the recipients to emigrate. One explicitly exempts them from the duty (B. 'Amr of Ḥuzā'a, cf. above, note 80), while another exempts their bedouin section without imposing it on their settled members (Aslam, cf. above, note 77). The rest either require the recipients to separate from infidels (vol. i/2, pp. 21-3, 25, 30 = pp. 107, 109-12, 114, 128: *wa-fāraqa al-mušrikīn*, twice replaced by *wa-ḥāraba al-mušrikīn* (at p. 22 = 109) or else make no mention of separation or emigration at all. It is not clear whether the *firaq* is to be envisaged as actual departure or as mere termination of friendly relations with infidels. Rubin interprets it as actual departure («Hijra», section B, 3), but those who are to engage in it are often confirmed in their possession of their lands and wells and merely required to hand over a fifth of their booty, pay *zakāt* (on their animals) or *ṣadaqa* on their fruits, keep the roads safe and so on. One would not have inferred that they left.

¹¹⁶ I. Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, tr. S.M. Stern, London 1971-, vol. ii, pp. 224; Rubin, 'Hijra', section B, 4.

¹¹⁷ Donner, *Conquests*, p. 79. For arguments against this interpretation, see the review by E. Landau-Tasserion in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 6 (1985), pp. 501f (add Haytamī, *Mağma' al-zawā'id*, vol. v, p. 255.4 where 'Ā'īša identifies the emigrants of Muḥammad's time as *ahl al-qurā*). Ibn Ḥaldūn goes to the other extreme when he claims that bedouin were not required to emigrate at all in the Prophet's time (cited in Madelung, «Hijra», pp. 225f).

¹¹⁸ Rubin, 'Hijra', section A, argues that the original meaning was 'transfer to a town', with reference to *ḥḡr* in the sense of town and lexicographical material. But though one would agree with him that there is more to the concept than the severance of ties, the lexicographers simply reproduce the distinction between bedouin and *muhāğirūn* current in the Umayyad period; and though *ḥḡr* in the sense of town (attested in the South Arabian epigraphical material and in the name of al-Hağar) could be relevant, both Qur'ān and Ḥadīṭ suggest that the additional meaning had more to do with getting together for war than with sedentarization as such.

Whereas the Qurʾān never contrasts bedouin with emigrants, the Umayyad material regularly does, as has been seen. Possibly, settled Arabs who had stuck to their homes were less conspicuous from the vantage point of the new garrison towns, or less desirable as soldiers, than were bedouin. In any case, settled Arabs who stayed put were now classified as bedouin themselves, in so far as they attracted attention: thus the Hīrans and the Meccans, for example¹¹⁹. It was the bedouin who had become the paradigmatic shirkers. Hence it was also to them that the Qurʾānic prohibition of *walāya* with non-emigrants was taken to refer; and since the prohibition implied that emigration was necessary for membership of the *umma*¹²⁰, bedouinism was widely regarded as tantamount to infidelity: ‘Umar II treated bedouin and non-Muslims as close to identical (above, no. 48); al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī equated the *hiğra* of bedouin with their conversion (above, no. 51); al-Ḥağğāğ and others regarded *taʿarrub baʿda ʿl-hiğra* as tantamount to apostasy¹²¹, or as a grave sin¹²²; and the frequency with which Prophetic traditions deny that non-emigrants were excluded from salvation shows that they were widely regarded as doomed to perdition.

All this had changed by early ʿAbbāsīd times, however. Practically all jurists now accepted the bedouin as full members of the *umma*; and though some continued to deny them a share in the *fay*’ (except in so far as they qualified under Q. 59:7/8)¹²³, the majority granted them that right as well¹²⁴, on the grounds that the duty of *hiğra* had been abolished and that all Muslims were now *muhāğirūn* in the sense of believers regardless of their whereabouts: it was in support of this view that the traditions of groups 1 and 2 were

¹¹⁹ Cf. no. 52 in the list above, and note 153 below.

¹²⁰ As Madelung notes (*«Hijra»*, p. 230).

¹²¹ Al-Ḥağğāğ (or Burayda) accused Salama b. al-Akwaʿ of *irtidād ʿan al-hiğra* (below, note 145; cf. also Kister, «Land Property and *jihād*», pp. 279f). Compare Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, pp. 324f, no. 558, where a general of the early conquests implicitly excludes bedouin from the *ğamāʿa*. Naturally, the view that those who turned bedouin after emigration were apostates is ascribed to the Prophet himself (Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. v, no. 3881; vol. vi, nos. 4090, 4428).

¹²² Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, pp. 112f, 309, nos. 203, 530. In the story of al-Nābiğa, ʿUṭmān merely identifies it as *makrūh* (below, note 144).

¹²³ The proof text was the Prophetic tradition on *aʿrāb al-muslimīn*, which endorses the Muslim status of the bedouin but denies them a share in the *fay*’ (cf. the list above, no 5; Yaḥyā b. Ādam, *Ḥarāğ*, pp. 5f; Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, pp. 303-6).

¹²⁴ Madelung, *«Hijra»*, pp. 236ff.

adduced¹²⁵. It does not seem likely that this wholehearted endorsement of the bedouin’s status as full members of the *umma* should have been accomplished in the time of Muḥammad, reversed under the Umayyads and then accomplished again by the classical scholars. The developmental scheme is familiar enough, of course, but it seems more economical to assume that the Prophet traditions reflect the debate of the scholars themselves. Some take the duty of *hiğra* for granted and merely exempt individuals or groups from it while others abolish the duty itself, but all tell us that membership of the *umma* does not depend on whereabouts. All, in short, are evidence for the process whereby the post-conquest distinction between emigrants and bedouin was effaced and eventually rejected.

Group 2

The message of the material of group 2 is to some extent identical with that of group 1: faith does not depend on whereabouts; given that *hiğra* does not exist any more, all believers, including bedouin, enjoy the same position and are all entitled to a share in the *fay*’. But whereas the traditions of group 1 abolish the duty of *hiğra* by elevating all Muslims to the status of *Muhāğirūn* in a metaphorical sense, those of group 2 terminate it at a specific point in time, so that the historical stump of the literal duty remains: and it is this stump which is *hiğra* in the classical sense of the word. The cut-off point is usually identified as *al-faṭḥ*, which some scholars took to be the events of al-Ḥudaybiyya¹²⁶, but which was classically understood as the conquest of Mecca; and in its classical interpretation the material has as much to say about Mecca as it does about emigration, a point to which I shall come back.

Unlike the traditions of group 1, those of group 2 are not normally taken at face value by modern scholars. In Madelung’s reconstruction, for example, the duty to emigrate falls into abeyance first in the Prophet’s time in response to overcrowding in Medina, reflected in group 1, and next under the early ʿAbbāsīds

¹²⁵ Thus Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, pp. 303ff; Ibn Zayd in Rubin, «Hijra», section C, 1.

¹²⁶ G.R. Hawting, ‘al-Ḥudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 8 (1986).

in response to long-term developments, reflected in group 2. Though one can dispute his interpretation of group 1, Madelung is undoubtedly right as far as group 2 is concerned. Indeed, the long-term developments account very well for all of the material.

In the course of the Umayyad period, residence in a garrison city ceased to be synonymous with military service; the payment of stipends was gradually restricted to professional soldiers and other public servants, while the bulk of Muslims took to making a living on their own. Under those circumstances it obviously ceased to make sense that people should be obliged to live in garrison cities. Why should their status as members of the *umma* be doubtful merely because they lived in the desert or in villages? Why should they be branded as backsliders or even apostates if they took to earning their keep as pastoralists or peasants? One could worship God and shun evil wherever one was. The institution of *hiġra* remained alive as long as the Umayyads recruited bedouin soldiers, and the Syrians defended it longer than anyone else¹²⁷; but it cannot have retained much significance when the ʿAbbāsids replaced the Syrian armies with Ḥurāsānī troops, and it must have been then that the “Ḥiġāzī position that the duty of *hiġra* had been abolished by the Prophet after the conquest ... found backing by consensus”, as Madelung says¹²⁸. This accords with the fact that the open-ended concept of *hiġra* is densely attested from the conquests to the 720’s, but practically gone by c. 800, except in connection with non-Arab converts.

But Madelung’s position is not as clearcut as one might like. Although it is in the ʿAbbāsīd period that he finds a context for the classical *lā hiġra* tradition, he assumes it to have been in circulation for so long before it won general acceptance that for practical purposes he equips it with the usual history of origin in the earliest times, suspension under the Umayyads and restoration under the ʿAbbāsīds: thus he implies that it was known to Muʿāwiya, who supposedly disliked it; and he treats it as familiar to ʿUmar II, who “did not accept” this tradition, as he puts it¹²⁹. But Muʿāwiya’s appearance as the transmitter of one of the counter-traditions does not of course mean that moves were afoot for the closure of *hiġra*

¹²⁷ Cf. Cook, *Dogma*, p. 101 and note 127 thereto; below, note 130.

¹²⁸ Madelung, «Hijra», p. 235.

¹²⁹ Madelung, «Hijra», pp. 235, 227.

already in his days¹³⁰; and given that ʿUmar II never mentions the *lā hiġra* tradition, it seems more reasonable to infer that he did not know it. Al-Saraḥsī and others similarly credit al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī with a conscious rejection or qualification of the closed concept of *hiġra*, though the chances are that he merely took the open-ended concept for granted¹³¹. Everybody seems to have done so in the mid-Umayyad period, not just the Umayyads and their supporters, but also their inveterate enemies, the Ḥārīġites. It is well known that the Azāriqa, Naġadāt and other Ḥārīġites of the Umayyad period held *hiġra* from the abode of non-Ḥārīġites to be obligatory¹³², referred to their camps as abodes of *hiġra*¹³³ and called themselves *muhāġirūn*¹³⁴; and as might be expected, the sources mostly interpret this as an obligation to re-enact the Prophet’s emigration rather than to continue it: thus Sālim b. Ḍakwān credits Naġda with the view that one must make a *hiġra* “like the *hiġra* of the Prophet” and invokes the classical *lā hiġra* tradition against him¹³⁵; and the parallel with the Prophet’s Medina is also explicit in al-Aṣʿarī’s account of the Azāriqa¹³⁶. But

¹³⁰ It shows that there was resistance to the abolition of *hiġra* in circles apt to invoke the Umayyads as their authorities, clearly Syrians (cf. Cook, *Dogma*, p. 202, note 127, where Marwān is also invoked).

¹³¹ Cf. the list above, no. 51 (al-Ḥasan “did not consider this rule to have been abrogated”); al-Ṭabarsī, *Maġmaʿ al-bayān li-ʿulūm al-qurʿān*, ed. H. al-Rasūlī al-Maḥallātī, Tehran n.d., vol. iii, pp. 562f; al-Ṭūsī, *al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-qurʿān*, ed. A. Š. al-Amin and A. H. Qasir al-ʿĀmilī, Naġaf 1957-65, vol. v, p. 166, both *ad* 8:74f/75f (al-Ḥasan said that “the *hiġra* of the bedouin to garrison cities will continue until the Day of Resurrection”).

¹³² Al-Aṣʿarī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn*, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1929-33, pp. 86f, 89, 91, 115, 120; Sālim b. Ḍakwān, *Sīra* (in the Hinds Xerox, Cambridge University Library, microfilm Or. 1402), pp. 175, 178f; cf. Cook, *Dogma*, pp. 3f, 17, 97.

¹³³ See for example Ibn Aʿtam, *Futūḥ*, vol. vii, p. 17 (Sābūr was the *dār al-hiġra* of the Azāriqa); al-Mubarrad, *al-kāmil fī l-luġa wa-l-adab wa-l-naḥw wa-l-taṣrīf*, ed. Z. al-Mubārak and A. M. Šakir, Cairo 1936-7, vol. iii, p. 1053 (the Azāriqa would not declare anyone an infidel in their *dār al-hiġra* except for killers of Muslims). Ḥārīġites were prone to turning the execution sites of their martyrs into abodes of *hiġra* (al-Balāḍurī, *Ansāb al-aṣrāf*, vol. ivb, ed. M. Schloessinger, Jerusalem 1938, p. 94.10; Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, vol. iii, p. 1022, both with reference to the 680’s; Ibn al-Aʿrī, *al-Kāmil fī l-taʿrīḥ*, ed. C. J. Tornberg, Leiden 1851-76, vol. v, p. 88, with reference to 105/723-4; M. J. de Goeje (ed.), *Kitāb al-uṣyūn wa-l-ḥadāʾiq*, Leiden 1871, p. 108, 4 up, with reference to the reign of Hišām).

¹³⁴ Ibn Aʿtam, *Futūḥ*, vol. vi, pp. 46.3, 298.7; vol. vii, pp. 60, ult., 63, 3 up, 68. 10; Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, vol. iii, p. 1065, 3 up, cf. 1088. 11, 1140, 5 up; Ibn Abī ʿl-Ḥadīd, *Šarḥ naḥġ al-balāġa*, ed. M. A. F. Ibrāhīm, Cairo 1965, vol. iv, p. 149. 5, cf. 161. 14 (Azāriqa).

¹³⁵ Sālim, *Sīra*, p. 175; Cook, *Dogma*, p. 17, 100ff.

¹³⁶ Aṣʿarī, *Maqālāt*, pp. 88f.

the Ḥārīgites themselves saw *hiğra* and *ğihād* as ongoing duties¹³⁷. Like their opponents, they identified emigration to a military centre as indispensable for Muslim status and took the Qurʾānic prohibition of *walāya* with non-emigrants to exclude social relations with bedouin, from whom they duly dissociated even when the latter shared their views¹³⁸; and unlike later heretics, they did not appoint *naqībs* or *dāʿīs* in their abodes of emigration, or call their followers *ansār*: their concept of *hiğra* was Qurʾānic, not inspired by the *Sīra*. When the Azāriqa attacked Basra, the Basrans feared having to abandon their *hiğra* by leaving Basra (above, no. 43), whereas the Azāriqa refused to acknowledge Basra as a *dār al-hiğra* and enjoined emigration to their own camp instead: the concept of emigration was the same on the two sides of the fence. The first evidence for actual re-enactment of the Prophet's *hiğra* seems to be furnished by the Hāšimiyya in Ḥurāsān, who called Marw (or Ḥurāsān at large) their *dār al-hiğra*¹³⁹, appointed *dāʿīs* and *naqībs*, and eventually elevated their followers to the status of *ansār* (*al-daʿwalal-dawla*). It seems gratuitous to assume that the closed concept of *hiğra* had been present from the start when it is only in the transitional period between the two dynasties that we begin to see it.

Group 3

The traditions of group 3 defend the open concept of *hiğra*, and all are Syrian; it is because Muʿāwiya was an authority to the Syrians that he appears as the transmitter of one of them¹⁴⁰. They

¹³⁷ This is clear from their very name, which is a self-designation derived from Q. 4: 99/101 (*wa-man yahruġu min baytihi muhāğiran ilā ʾllāh*, cf. R.E. Brünnow, *Die Charidschiten unter den ersten Omayyaden*, Leiden 1884, pp. 28f). Compare also the story of how al-Muhallab sowed dissension among the Azraqites (Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, vol. iii, p. 1040): he asked them about the fate of two men who go out *muhāğirayn ilaykum*, one of them dying on the way and the other managing to arrive, only to fail his *miğna*. This sowed dissension because neither man had passed his exam, but Q. 4: 99/101 promises those who go out *muhāğiran ilā allāh wa-rasūlihi* their reward even if they die on the way. The Azāriqa evidently took the Qurʾānic injunction to emigrate to be addressed to themselves, not just to past believers whose obligation had been abolished on the conquest of Mecca.

¹³⁸ Sālim, *Sīra*, p. 173; cf. Cook, *Dogma*, p. 96 (where this is puzzling).

¹³⁹ *Ahbār al-dawla al-ʿabbāsiyya*, ed. ʿA.ʿA. al-Dūrī and ʿA.-J. al-Muṭṭalibī, Beirut 1971, p. 199; al-Šāhib b. ʿAbbād, *Rasāʾil*, ed. ʿA.-W. ʿAzzām and Š. Dayf, Cairo 1947, p. 23. 7.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. above, notes 127, 130.

take it for granted that *hiğra* and *ğihād* are related activities and assert that both will continue for ever, which agrees with the fact that when the generality of Muslim lawyers declared *ğihād* to be a *farğ kifāya*, the Syrians took the dissenting view that it was a *farğ ʿayn*, every Muslim being individually obliged to engage in holy war according to them. The Syrians were so preoccupied with *ğihād* that they did not know much about anything else, as Mālik is supposed to have told al-Manşūr¹⁴¹, but their attempt to salvage the open-ended concept of *hiğra* was not successful.

The fate of the pre-classical material

It is the traditions of group 2, and above all the classical *lā hiğra* tradition, which lie behind all conventional accounts of the development of the concept of *hiğra*, be they Muslim or Islamicist: all take it for granted that *hiğra* in the original sense of the word came to an end in the lifetime of the Prophet. The classical position is neatly illustrated by al-Māwardī, who unselfconsciously crams a whole century's development into the Prophet's life. "The word *hiğra* only applies to those who emigrated from their home to Medina in search of Islam", he says, forgetting the *muhāğirūn* to garrison cities or perhaps dismissing them as pale reflections of the genuine article. "Every tribe that emigrated in its entirety was called *al-Barara*, while those which emigrated in part were known as *al-Ḥiyara*", he continues, automatically taking Sayf's information on Muhāğirūn in Abū Bakr's Iraq to relate to those in Muḥammad's Medina (cf. above, no. 7). "After the conquest (of Mecca) the duty of *hiğra* ceased to apply, and the Muslims now came to include both Muhāğirūn and bedouin", he adds, innocently forgetting that the bedouin still had not come to be accepted as full members of the *umma* by Umayyad times. "In the time of the Prophet the people of *ṣadaqa* were known as bedouin while the people of *fay*' were known as Muhāğirūn", he concludes, adducing the verse *muhāğir laysa bi-ʿarabī* cited by al-Ḥağğāğ in illustration (cf. no. 42) on the automatic assumption that the anonymous poet quoted by al-Ḥağğāğ was a contemporary of the Prophet¹⁴².

¹⁴¹ Van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft*, vol. i, p. 68.

¹⁴² Al-Māwardī, *al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya*, ed. M. Enger, Bonn 1853, pp. 210f.

A whole century's development is likewise crammed into the lifetime of the Prophet when the classical texts illustrate the reprehensible act of *ta'arrub ba'da 'l-hiġra* with exclusive reference to departures from the Prophet's Medina, though here some asymmetries survived: for it is not clear why Abū Ḍarr should have accused 'Uṭmān of returning him to bedouinism by exiling him to al-Rabaḍa if the Prophet had declared that one could now be a *muhāġir* "even in the ravines"¹⁴³, or why al-Nābiġa should have needed 'Uṭmān's permission to leave Medina for the desert if the duty of *hiġra* had been abolished¹⁴⁴, let alone how al-Ḥaġġāġ could accuse Salama b. Akwa' of *irtidād 'an al-hiġra* some eighty years after the abolition of *hiġra* had supposedly been effected¹⁴⁵.

Asymmetries also survived in the form of all the passages on *hiġra* in its open-ended sense collected in the above list. They do not seem to have been a source of anguish, presumably because they were taken to refer to *hiġra* of a lesser and imitative kind: they were about *al-hiġra ba'da l-hiġra*, 'the emigration after (the real) *hiġra*', as 'Alī called it (above, no. 16), carefully making the distinction between *hiġra* in the Prophet's time and thereafter which Madelung has now reaffirmed. Several types of *hiġra* were known to later scholars too, for though all accepted that the historical emigration from Mecca to Medina had come to an end, they obviously did not think that *hiġra* in the spiritual sense of turning to God or shunning evil had been terminated¹⁴⁶, and many held that physical emigration continued to be a duty on Muslims who fell under infidel rule. In favour of these views they would adduce the counter-traditions of group 3¹⁴⁷. Historically, the counter-traditions of group 3 were out to preserve *hiġra* as a duty to emigrate physically for service under

¹⁴³ Balāḍurī, *Ansāb*, vol. v, p. 54; cf. Athamina, «*A'rāb and Muhājirūn*», pp. 11f.

¹⁴⁴ *Aġānī*, vol. v, p. 10.

¹⁴⁵ Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, vol. vii, p. 151, ult.; Buḥārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. iv, p. 373; al-Bayhaqī, *Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā*, Hyderabad 1344-55, vol. ix, p. 19; cf. Bosworth, 'Ta'arrub', p. 358; above, note 78.

¹⁴⁶ Tahāwī, for example, calls the spiritual *hiġra*, or *hiġrat al-sū'*, 'the second *hiġra*', explaining that it does not require departure from one's home and that it is the *hiġra* which continues after the conquest of Mecca (*Muškil*, vol. iii, p. 260).

¹⁴⁷ Z.-I. Rhan, *The Origins and Development of the Concept of Hijra or Migration in Islam*, unpublished PhD thesis, Manchester 1987, pp. 78ff; cf. also Sāliḥ b. Maḥdī al-Maqbīlī, *al-Manār fī l-muḥtār min ġawāḥir al-baḥr al-zahḥār*, Beirut 1988, vol. ii, p. 511; Rubin, «Hijra», notes 180-3, on Ibn Ḥajar. The issue is discussed in F. Meier, «Über die umstrittene Pflicht des Muslims, bei nichtmuslimischer Besetzung seines Landes auszuwandern», *Der Islam* 68 (1991).

legitimate rulers, not as a spiritual journey or as a flight from infidels: what they defended was movement in support of caliphs who represented God's cause, so that joining them was both a physical journey and a spiritual *hiġra ilā allāh wa-rasūlihi*, as it had been in the Prophet's time. It was in this vein that 'Umayr b. Hānī' could speak of a *hiġra* to God and his Messenger and a *hiġra* to Yazīd III (above, no. 53). But Bišr b. Abī Kubār al-Balawī, writing about 800, is the last author to whom this concept of *hiġra* is alive (above, no. 56).

The meaning of the reinterpretation

The open-ended concept of *hiġra* is one of the rare Islamic notions of which we can unequivocally say that they take us back to the beginnings. It encapsulates the fact that Islamic history started with a great departure: to convert was to leave one's home in order to fight for the cause; salvation lay in going forth for heroic ventures and a new world ahead, not in patiently staying by one's fields or camels. *Hiġra* as originally understood was nothing if not a concept of mobilization. By the same token its lifespan was limited, for it is only at the beginning of a revolution that salvation lies in going forth: one cannot sit on bayonets, as Napoleon is reputed to have said. Muslim society could not remain a camp for ever, however attached the Syrians might be to the idea. Once the new world had been established, the *Aufbruchsstimmung* of the early days gave way to the settled mentality of the classical pattern, and the open-ended concept of *hiġra* had to be closed.¹⁴⁸

The first-century concept of *hiġra* thus evokes a bygone era, and this is perhaps where its main interest lies. But there are also other things of interest to be learnt from its demise. The fact that the Muslims had to divest themselves of the open concept of *hiġra* does not explain why they put its end where they did. They might have linked its abolition to the first civil war, for example, or to the waning of the great conquests: the latter would have been historically correct. But given that the Muslims liked to have the Prophet's own verdict on all questions of classical concern, it is not surprising that

¹⁴⁸ I owe both the thought in this paragraph and the term *Aufbruchsstimmung* to Fritz Zimmermann, whose comments on the first draft of this article made the point more vividly than I have been able to do.

they made him abolish the duty of *hiġra* in person, be it at unspecified times or on the *fath*, or by dying. But why did the view that he abolished it on the conquest of Mecca win universal acceptance?

The answer presumably lies in the fact that it could be used to make at least three important statements about Mecca. First, by identifying the conquest of Mecca as the cut-off point, the tradition singles out the conquest of Mecca as the culmination of Muḥammad's career: the one and only purpose of emigration had been the *fath*; though there were to be many *futūḥ* thereafter, they were of a different and lesser order, for one could no longer gain the status of *muhāġir* by enlisting for holy war, be it in Medina (as the Sulamīs and others learnt) or in Syria (as Muġāhid was told). "The cancelling of the implementation of the *hiġra* principle after the conquest of Makka. ... reinforced the belief that *hiġra* was originally designed to strengthen the Muslim community in al-Madina, so as to increase the military potential of the Muslims in order to use it against Makka", as Athamina puts it¹⁴⁹. The message is that the Prophet's interest was focused on Mecca, the central shrine of Islam, not on conquests outside Arabia¹⁵⁰.

Secondly, the tradition could be used to highlight the Meccan identity of Muḥammad's supporters. "There is no *hiġra* today", ʿĀʾiṣā explains with reference to the conquest of Mecca; "the believer used to flee (*yafirru*) with his religion to God and His Messenger lest he be persecuted for it (*yuftana ʿalayhi*); but as for today, God has made Islam victorious, so the believer can worship God wherever he wants; but *ġihād* and *sunna* (continue)"¹⁵¹. Here emigration is explicitly identified as flight, clearly on the basis of the Qurʾānic passages on persecution, and the possibility of *hiġra* from places other than Mecca is implicitly denied, for the persecution is

¹⁴⁹ Athamina, «Aʿrāb and Muhājirūn», pp. 8f.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Ṭahāwī's explanation of the counter-tradition that *hiġra* will continue for as long as infidels are fought: it does not contradict the view that *hiġra* was abolished on the conquest of Mecca, for the infidels could be those of Mecca (*Muškil*, vol. iii, p. 257). Even Noth takes the Qurʾānic duty of *ġihād* for all Muslims to have been relaxed in the lifetime of the Prophet himself, presumably meaning after the conquest of Mecca (A. Noth, *Heiliger Krieg und Heiliger Kampf im Islam und Christentum*, Bonn 1966, p. 34).

¹⁵¹ Abū ʿUbayd, *Amwāl*, p. 312, no. 535; Buḥārī, vol. iii, pp. 35, 146; Ṭahāwī, *Muškil*, vol. iii, p. 254. 9, where the drift of the tradition is well brought out. *Sunna* is presumably a corruption of *niyya*.

envisaged as a purely Meccan phenomenon to which the *fath* has now put an end. The fact that numerous converts emigrated to Medina from places other than Mecca, and that Mecca would hardly have been conquered if this had not been the case, is quietly ignored. That Muḥammad's *hiġra* was a flight from persecution is a commonplace view in the literature, and it is of course also such that *hiġra* is envisaged in the enigmatic story of the emigration to Ethiopia, in which its link with *ġihād* has wholly disappeared and the emigrants are Meccans pure and simple.

Thirdly, the *lā hiġra* tradition could be used to absolve the Meccans from the stigma of living in the city the Prophet had left, as Cook and Rubin point out with reference to stories in which Qurašīs opt for continued residence in Mecca with the Prophet's blessing, having learnt that the duty of *hiġra* had come to an end¹⁵². But there was more than Meccan honour to the issue.

Being non-emigrants, the Meccans were regarded as bedouin, with whom one should not intermarry¹⁵³ and whose ability to achieve salvation was in doubt, as we learn from the traditions on Ṣafwān b. Umayya and another on Ġubayr b. Muṭʿim, who was assured by the Prophet that the Meccan would be rewarded for their good deeds even if they lived in a fox-hole¹⁵⁴. Mecca was moreover a city in which no Muslim should stay overnight according to ʿAlī¹⁵⁵, in which *muhāġirūn* should spend no more than three days after completing their pilgrimage according to the Prophet (as ʿUmar II was told when he enquired about *suknā Makka*)¹⁵⁶, in

¹⁵² Cook, *Dogma*, p. 100; Rubin, «Hijra», p. 33.

¹⁵³ Athamina, «Aʿrāb and Muhājirūn», p. 12, citing Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīḥ*, ser. ii, p. 825, where ʿAbd al-Malik castigates Ḥālid b. ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥālid b. Asīd for having appointed his brother, a *ʿrābiyyan min ahl Makka*, to the war against the Ḥārīġites; Ṭabarsī, *Maġmaʿ*, vol. iii, p. 563; Ṭūsī, *Tibyān*, vol. v, p. 166, both *ad* 8: 74f/75f, where al-Ḥasan prohibits intermarriage of Muhāġirūn and bedouin, and ʿUmar says "don't marry the people of Mecca, they are bedouin".

¹⁵⁴ Above, note 100, and Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. iv, pp. 82, ult., 83. 14, 85. 2; Hayṭamī, *Maġmaʿ al-zawāʿid*, vol. v, p. 252, 7 up, on Ġubayr b. Muṭʿim.

¹⁵⁵ Ibn Bābūyah, *ʿIlal al-ṣarāʾiʿ*, Najaf 1966, p. 452.

¹⁵⁶ Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. iv/2, p. 77; Ṭahāwī, *Muškil*, vol. iii, p. 255, where al-Sāʾib b. Yazīd cites al-ʿAlāʾ b. al-Ḥaḍramī's tradition from the Prophet *ṭalāt baʿda al-ṣadar* to ʿUmar II. Al-ʿAlāʾ's traditions on this subject are also cited in Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. v, p. 52, middle; and in al-Dahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. Š. al-Arnaʿūt and Ḥ. al-Asad, Beirut 1981-3, vol. i, no. 51 (al-ʿAlāʾ b. al-Ḥaḍramī), where numerous other attestations are listed; cf. also Rubin, «Hijra», note 168. Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, a contemporary of ʿUmar II, is nonetheless credited with a letter on the merit of living in Mecca (van Ess, *Theologie und Geschichte*, vol. ii, p. 46; drawn to my attention by Michael Cook).

which the Prophet himself refrained from setting foot in the houses when he returned from the pilgrimage¹⁵⁷, and in which it was the greatest misfortune for a *muhāğir* to die¹⁵⁸. No doubt all this was painful to the Meccans, but more importantly it made for an odd sanctuary: how could the holiest place of Islam be so unholy? In fact, all lands abandoned by emigrants were unholy, and returning to live or die in them jeopardized one's status as a believer wherever they might be: Mecca was no exception. It merely happened to be particularly unholy in that it was the Prophet himself who had left it¹⁵⁹. Hence it could not be successfully transformed into the central shrine of Islam unless the Prophet was made to soften the meaning of his departure, and this is what the *lā hiğra* tradition and its interpreters achieve. Their message is that the Prophet's mission was an essentially Meccan enterprise from beginning to end: both he and his followers were Meccans, and though they had to flee from Mecca in response to Meccan pressure, their period in Medina was a mere interlude, not a permanent departure, for the one and only object of their *hiğra* was *al-fath*. The Prophet's *hiğra* was a reluctant departure, not a rejection: "by God, you are God's best land and the dearest of God's land unto God; if I were not expelled from you, I would not leave", as another tradition has him exclaim on his departure¹⁶⁰.

The closure of the duty of *hiğra* is thus connected, not only with the waning of the Umayyad conquest society, but also with the elevation of Mecca to the central sanctuary of Islam. The literary sources contain residues of the view that Muḥammad's ambitions included the conquest of Syria¹⁶¹, and what the open-ended concept of *hiğra* suggests is precisely that the occupation of Mecca was preparatory to conquests on a wider scale: it comes across as a step towards the consolidation of Muslim power in Arabia that was required for campaigns outside it, not as an end in itself. At the same time, literary and archaeological sources seem to indicate that

¹⁵⁷ Wāqidi, *Mağāzī*, vol. ii, p. 829.

¹⁵⁸ Rubin, «Hiğra», notes 165-8; Athamina, «A'rāb and Muhāğirūn», p. 12.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Ibn Bābūyah above, notes 155: 'Alī said that one should not stay overnight in a land *hāğara minhā rasūl allāh*.

¹⁶⁰ Al-Dārimī, *al-Sunan*, ed. 'A.H. Yamānī, Cairo 1966, vol. ii, p. 156, no. 2513.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, pp. 7f, for the non-Muslim evidence; Donner, *Conquests*, pp. 101ff, for the Muslim material.

from the time of 'Umar to 'Abd al-Malik the Muslims prayed in the direction of a central sanctuary in northern Arabia, or to Jerusalem, or to a plurality of sanctuaries, suggesting that the classical status of Mecca may be the outcome of an evolution stretching beyond Muḥammad's lifetime¹⁶². But the closure of the concept of *hiğra* drives a wedge between Muḥammad's campaigns and the great conquests and firmly identifies Arabia in general and Mecca in particular as the holy land, making the great conquests appear semi-accidental and reducing the rival sanctuaries of the post-conquest period to deviant *qiblas* for which the Muslims, in so far as they remembered them, unsurprisingly chose to blame the Umayyads¹⁶³.

Once again, then, we encounter the evolutionary scheme whereby the Prophet creates an institution which the Umayyads supposedly change and which has been 'restored' by the time the sources set in (though in this case, as in that of *hiğra*, the 'change' is attested already under 'Umar¹⁶⁴). Is it not time that we try to go beyond this scheme? The Umayyad period must be one of the most creative centuries of Islamic history, or indeed any history; and yet it is remembered above all as a century of impious deviation from an established tradition. This is an extraordinary fact, and we shall not be able to make sense of this fact, or of the formative period in general, unless we remember that the Muslim recollection of the Prophet reflects the lives and thoughts of all the believers who created a new civilization in allegiance to him, not just those of Muḥammad himself.

¹⁶² Cf. Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, pp. 23f (and P. Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam*, Princeton and Oxford 1987, p. 198, note 131); P. Carlier, 'Qastal al-Balqa': an Umayyad Site in Jordan' in M.A. Bağit and R. Schick (eds.), *The Fourth International Conference on the History of Bilād al-Sām during the Umayyad Period*, vol. ii, Amman 1989, pp. 118f, 134 (drawn to my attention by R. Hoyland); S. Bashear, «Qur'ān 2: 114 and Jerusalem», *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52 (1989), pp. 237f; id. «Qibla Musharriqa and Early Muslim Prayer in Churches», *The Muslim World* 81 (1991); M. Sharon, «The birth of Islam in the Holy Land» in M. Sharon (ed.), *Pillars of Smoke and Fire. The Holy Land in History and Thought*, Johannesburg 1988. Compare also the tradition *lā yaşluhu qiblatān fi arđ wa-laysa 'ala 'l-muslim ġizya*, which must date from the Umayyad period since it was then that converts were made to pay *ğizya* (Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Šākir, vol. iii, no. 1949).

¹⁶³ Cf. Ğāğiz, *Risāla fi banī Umayya*, p. 296, on the *qibla* of Wāsiṭ.

¹⁶⁴ The first mosque in Kufa, which was orientated to the west rather than the south, was built by Sa'd b. Abi Waqqās, a close companion of the Prophet, in the caliphate of 'Umar (Balāğurī, *Futūḥ*, p. 276).