One of the basic facts of Arabic literature is that many works known (or alleged) to have existed in the medieval period have not survived to modern times. Investigation of the existing literature thus sometimes involves attempts to reconstruct lost sources. Such attempts may take two different directions that are, in reality, two sides of the same coin. First, the various sources of a given extant work may be traced; second, a lost work may be reconstructed from quotations preserved in later texts.

As early as 1856 Alois Sprenger addressed the issue of the sources used by Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767) and al-Wâqidî (d. 207/823), and in 1898 a book was published on the sources of the Mu‘jam al-Buldân of Yāqūt (d. 626/1229). Editors of medieval Arabic texts often investigate the sources used by the authors. Numerous studies have also been published on individual medieval authors and their sources, such as Ibn Ishāq, Abū Mikhnafl (d. 157/773), al-Azdi (fl. ca. 180/796), Sayf ibn ‘Umar (d. 180/796), al-Haytham ibn ‘Adî (d. 207/822),

1 In this paper I focus on historiography, but the issues raised are relevant to other genres as well. The paper has been circulating among colleagues and cited as “forthcoming” for years. It was first submitted in 1989 for publication by the Late Antiquity and Early Islam Project (London). However, because of recurrent delays I have chosen to publish it here, somewhat revised. Although many years have passed since the paper was written, I did not find it necessary to update it. However, I append the titles of a few recent publications relevant to the present discussion.
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al-Madā‘ini (d. 225/840), al-Bukhāri (d. 256/870), al-Balādhurī (d. 279/892), Ibn Abī l-Dunyā (d. 281/894), al-Ṭabarî (d. 310/923), Ibn ‘Abd Rabbîhi (d. 328/940), Sa‘îd ibn Baṭriq (d. 328/940), al-Mas‘ūdî (d. 345/956), Abū al-Faraj al-ISfahānî (d. 356/967), al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādî (d. 463/1071), and Mawhūb ibn Mansûr ibn Mufarrîj (fifth/eleventh century).

Since 1967 scholars have had at their disposal the technique developed by Fuat Sezgin for the purpose of reconstructing the (written) sources of a given work. This technique involves the examination and collation of the isnâds, or chains of transmission which occur in the work. According to Sezgin, the key transmitters are actually authors, and the accounts quoted from them are actually taken from their writings. But Gregor Schoeler has assembled evidence which seems to contradict one of Sezgin’s main conclusions, namely, that the quotations in the later sources all derive from earlier written records, and therefore enable a perfect reconstruction of lost books. Such a conclusion, argues Schoeler, is too optimistic; yet he considers Sezgin’s method to be of vital importance.

The application of Sezgin’s technique as a tool for both identifying the sources of a given work and reconstructing them, pursued throughout his own research, is also illustrated in the works of Bellamy, Hinds, Ursula Sezgin and Rotter. The first two trace the sources used by the medieval authors examined by them, while U. Sezgin and Rotter combine both the tracing and the reconstruction of the sources.
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Pure reconstructions do not in fact necessitate the application of Sezgin’s method because they mainly consist in the mechanical collection of the fragments that are ascribed to a given authority. Indeed, the idea of recovering lost works by excerpting them from later sources is already inherent in the works of Sprenger and Josef Horovitz, although technically these two scholars did not attempt the actual reconstruction of Arabic texts. Partial reconstructions of the works of several authors were made by ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-Dûrî. Wilhelm Hoenerbach gleaned from the *Iṣâba* of Ibn Ḥajjar (d. 852/1449) all the fragments of the *Kitâb al-ridda* by Wathïma ibn Mûsâ (d. 237/851). Hoenerbach believed in reconstruction to the point of considering a certain late source as a full substitute for an earlier one preserved in it.

In more recent years further attempts have been made to reconstruct the historical works of the early scholars ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 94/712) and his pupil Muḥammad b. Shihâb al-Zuhrî (d. 124/740). Husayn ‘Aṭwân has made inventories of the fragments which he found under the name of al-Zuhrî, and Muḥammad Muṣṭafâ al-‘A‘zami has prepared a full-scale reconstruction of ‘Urwa’s *Kitâb al-maghâzî*. Obviously, such reconstructed material cannot be taken to represent whole original works, because there is no way of knowing how much of the original has been omitted by the sources at hand. Besides, there are other serious problems with reconstructions, and in the next few pages I should like to deal with two of them: false ascriptions, and the metamorphoses of transmitted texts.

---
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False Ascriptions

Reconstruction consists in collecting material which is ascribed to a given authority, but the ascription may be non-genuine. This statement may seem self-explanatory to the point of being banal, yet most of the scholars who have attempted reconstructions have tended to disregard this possibility. The false ascription of small, isolated literary units, that is, invention of *ḥadīths* and *akhbār*, is beyond need for proof. It should be noted, however, that when collected and compiled such units may accumulate to the size of whole books. Were we to collect the material ascribed to, say, the famous Companion Abū Hurayra, we could easily produce an “excerpted copy” of a book by him. As a matter of fact, the sources do mention a book by Abū Hurayra that was (allegedly?) arranged by later hands. Medieval Muslim scholars engaged in this sort of research themselves, and the result was the production of *musnad* works. In these works traditions were arranged according to the names of the Companions who purportedly transmitted them from the Prophet. Also, the material attributed to certain scholars was sometimes compiled by later hands and called after both the compiler and the scholar, e.g. “the *musnad* of the traditions of Sufyān al-Thawrī, by Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī”. In spite of the popularity of the genre, the traditionist al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) observes that a *musnad* necessarily contains unreliable material, because the compiler must include in it everything that purports to have been transmitted from the sources that he compiles.

In *ḥadīth* as well as in early historiography, the collected quotations ascribed to a certain authority do not necessarily represent the genuine work of that authority. Even a manuscript that bears an author’s name is no guarantee that all the material contained in it indeed originated with that author. If false ascriptions of complete works are not very common, interpolations of foreign material, which are less obvious, may be more widespread than is usually suspected.

---


30 Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Al-madkhal*, 7-8 (text), 11-12 (trans.).

A few examples may illustrate this statement. The Vienna manuscript of al-Wâqidî’s *Kitâb al-maghâzî*, which was discovered by Von Kremer and edited by him in 1855, contains a passage transmitted on the authority of Ibn Ishâq. It appears to be an integral part of al-Wâqidî’s text. Von Kremer identified the passage as an interpolation on the ground that nowhere else in the *Maghâzî* does al-Wâqidî refer to Ibn Ishâq. A comparison with Jones’ 1966 edition, which is based on fuller and better manuscript evidence, shows that Von Kremer was right: the passage which he suspected is replaced by another in which no mention of Ibn Ishâq is made. 32 A second case is the Berlin fragment of the *Kitâb al-maghâzî* by Mûsâ ibn ‘Uqba (d. 141/758), which was edited by Eduard Sachau in 1904. Sachau believed that the last of the twenty passages contained in the fragment was not genuine. According to Schacht, a more substantial part of the fragment is not genuine. 33 Yet another example is the *Ta’rîkh* of Khalîfa b. Khayyât (d. 240/854), which contains additions by the transmitter Baqiyy b. Makhland (d. 276/889). These additions appear as part of the text, but were identified by the editor as interpolations after a close examination of the *isnâds*. 34 False ascriptions are not necessarily forgeries in our sense and negative connotation of the word. They may rise from the very method of transmission common in the Muslim world, and the practices connected with it. Khalîfa’s transmitter, for instance, did not intend to cheat. This much is clear from the fact that he sometimes inserted the words *qâla Khalîfa*, “Khalîfa said”, after the passages which he added, thereby indicating resumption of Khalîfa’s narrative and separating the additions from the original text. It appears that as late as the third century, and possibly later, it was permissible for transmitters and editors to omit, add and insert their own opinions and knowledge into the texts that they were transmitting, without giving precise indications of what they were doing. 35

Indeed, the very concept and system of accumulating knowledge in the early Muslim world brought about a situation in which it is sometimes difficult to determine the correct ascription of material and the precise role played by the scholars connected with it. On the one hand, the transmitters took liberties with the texts that they were transmitting, and on the other, the authors basic activity was the transmission of received knowledge. Thus, when Zolondek found in the *Kitâb al-aghâni* a statement that al-Iṣfâhâni had copied from “a book of al-Ḥaramî b. al-‘Alâ’ on the authority of al-Zubayr ibn Bakkâr” (*nasakhutu min kitâb al-Ḥaramî b. al-‘Alâ’ an al-Zubayr ibn Bakkâr*), he sensed a problem: was al-Iṣfâhâni copying from a work of Ibn Bakkâr transmitted by al-Ḥaramî, or was he copying from an independent work by al-Ḥaramî, who was using Ibn Bakkâr as his authority? 36 Similarly, Rotter found that the boundaries between the writings of al-Madâ’inî and his transmitters were somewhat obscure. 37 By comparison, al-A’zâmî’s approach is simpler: according to him, the distinction between authors and transmitters was not blurred but, as it happened, books were sometimes ascribed to their transmitters instead of their authors. 38 It seems to me that al-A’zâmî’s approach rather oversimplifies a complex reality. In any event, the task of reconstruction certainly becomes difficult when authorship cannot easily be determined.

The method of transmission by *qirâ’ā* in particular gave rise to false ascriptions. In this method, the student read aloud from a book, or recited material learned by heart, and the teacher listened, corrected where necessary, and finally gave the student permission to transmit the material in his (the teacher’s) name. 39 According to Sezgin, the student might also bring to the teacher texts which he had not originally heard from him, and be granted permission to transmit them in that teacher’s name. 40 Such practice, however, was frowned
upon. The traditionist ‘Abd Allâh b. Lahî’a (d. 204/820) was censured for being “careless, whatever [material] was brought before him, he had it read to him, then gave permission to transmit it in his own name, whether or not it belonged to his traditions. He excused himself by saying: “What can I do? People bring me written texts and say: ‘These are traditions which you have related’, so I grant them permission to transmit them [in my name]”. It is further reported that Haywa b. Shurayḥ bequeathed his books to someone who then proceeded to copy from the books the hadîths from the teachers who had taught both the deceased Haywa and Ibn Lahî’a. He then read the material to Ibn Lahî’a, who gave him permission to transmit it in his (Ibn Lahî’a name), even though Ibn Lahî’a had never heard these particular hadîths from his teachers. Because of this practice Haywa’s heir was considered “a man who does not fear God”. Obviously, such practices were condemned precisely because they gave rise to appropriations and false ascriptions, made either because of poor memory or on purpose. In attempted reconstructions, it must be borne in mind that the possibility of false ascription becomes even greater when the texts in question involve such respected authorities as ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr and Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrî, whose names are more likely than others to have been used by forgers. Sprenger already doubted whether the sîra ascribed to al-Zuhrî was actually written by him, and he concluded that the material transmitted by him was “arranged by a later hand, perhaps by his nephew Mohammad b. Abdallah b. Moslim”. In an age that has known the groundbreaking work of Goldziher and Schacht, it is difficult to exclude the possibility of false ascription from such an arrangement. It is also worthy of note that in addition to al-Zuhrî, several other important muhaddithûn are said to have had nephews who acted as transmitters of their works. Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Wahb (d. 264/877), nephew of ‘Abd Allâh b. Wahb (d.197/812), is of particular interest in this connection. He was mistrusted because he transmitted the Kitâb al-fitân on the authority of his uncle, whereas some scholars denied that Ibn Wahb ever trans-

41 Ibn Hajar, Tahâdhib, V, 375, 378, 379. See also al-Ḥākim al-Naysâbûrî, Al-madkhal, 39-41. Rotter, “Überlieferung”, mentions traditionists who forgot material which they had previously taught. Note that kitâb, kutub can refer to any written text, not necessarily to a book, see Ahmad, Al-tawthîq, 318-26.
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mitted such a book to anyone. This denial seems to imply that the existence of the Kitâb al-fitán was not universally recognized. 43

The Kitâb al-maghâzî of ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubayr, reconstructed by al-A’zamî, is no less problematic. Several authors mention ‘Urwa as “the first to have compiled a book on the biography of the Prophet” (awwal man allafa fi al-sîra), but all these sources are late: Ibn Khallikân (d. 681/1282), Ibn Hajar (d. 852/1449), al-Sakhâwî (d. 902/1497), and Hájjí Khalîfa (d. 1069/1658). Ibn Katîr quotes al-Wâqûdî as stating that ‘Urwa was the first to compile a maghâzî work; 44 but Ibn Katîr lived in the eighth/eleventh century, and there is no way to determine whether or not this quotation from al-Wâqûdî is genuine. In the fourth/tenth century, almost two centuries after al-Wâqûdî’s time, Ibn al-Nadîm did not list ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubayr among the authors of maghâzî books. All he has to offer in this connection is a reference to Abû Ḥâssân al-Ḥasan b. ʿUthmân al-Ziyâdî (d. 243/857), concerning whom he writes: “and a book of his is the Maghâzî of ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubayr” (wa-lahu min al-kutub Kitâb maghâzî ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubayr). In Ibn al-Nadîm’s terminology this means that Abû Ḥâssân was the compiler of a book entitled Maghâzî ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubayr, but the accuracy of the ascription to ‘Urwa is not established by this statement alone. 45

Stories about the fate of ‘Urwa’s book also arouse suspicion. According to al-Dhahabî (d. 748/1348), ‘Urwa effaced his writings because he was of the opinion that no book should exist except the book of God. One may ask, if that was his opinion, why did he have books in the first place? The story does not specify the effaced writings as ‘Urwa’s own compilations, but this is how Sprenger construed it, taking the account at face value and blaming ‘Urwa’s action for the loss of his Kitâb al-maghâzî. 46 There is, however, another story according to which ‘Urwa, during the battle of al-Ḥarra (64/683), burned fiqh
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books which he owned (i.e. not a work compiled by him), an act he reportedly regretted later. It is probable that there was never any fire, and that this story, as well as the preceding one, are part of the famous (and later) debate among Muslim scholars over the permissibility of writing down hadîth. It was Sprenger who first pointed to this debate, but he did not connect the ‘Urwa story with it.

The fact that the fire motif figures in biographies of other muḥaddithûn as well corroborates this hypothesis. The point of tales adducing this motif seems to be to show that respected authorities did possess and write books, and that the only reason these books were not handed down was that they were burned or otherwise destroyed. The stories adduced by F. Sezgin about the destruction of books by Companions, and by ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz, probably belong to the same category (although Sezgin interprets them as straightforward evidence for the early existence of books).

What emerges from this is the possibility that a complete book by ‘Urwa on the maghâzî perhaps was not lost, but rather never existed in the first place. Indeed, the Iraqi Shi‘î Hasan al-Šadr (end of the nineteenth-early twentieth cent.) held that the first scholar to write a sîra was Ibn Isḥaq, who was a Shi‘î. According to al-Šadr, this fact was deliberately obfuscated, and the claim was set forth that it was ‘Urwa – not a Shi‘î- who first compiled a maghâzî book. Al-Šadr was of course biased, but there is no reason to deny the possibility that ‘Urwa’s name was falsely used by later compilers. Ironically, ‘Urwa’s own son, Hishâm (d. 146/763), was accused of ascribing to his father material which he had never directly received from him.

There remains one matter to account for, namely the quotations which explicitly mention Maghâzî ‘Urwa. Judging from the material assembled by al-A‘zâmî, it appears that Ibn Ḥajar is the only author
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who mentions this title. As we shall see below, this does not mean that Ibn Ḥajar actually copied from a book by ‘Urwa, because second-hand quotations were permissible. Citation of the title by Ibn Ḥajar does not prove the existence of the book, for the following reason: Ibn Ḥajar shifted from the traditional method of quoting material by isnāds, to systematic references to books and authors. He therefore may have produced a title for the material traced back to ‘Urwa, in order to remain within the paradigm he was using to refer to sources. It is noteworthy that he also quotes ‘Urwa in the following manner: “Abū al-Aswad in his Maghāzī, on the authority of ‘Urwa.” Abū al-Aswad was one of the main transmitters from ‘Urwa, and again we are faced with the problem of authorship as opposed to a matter of “copyright”.

The evidence to hand does not justify the conclusion that all efforts to recover lost early works are doomed to failure, much less that all references to such works are false. The problem of false ascription does, however, oblige one to proceed very carefully, lest the reconstructed work include non-genuine material and perhaps even comprise an entirely new creation by the modern scholar.

The Metamorphoses of Transmitted Texts

A major problem with reconstructing lost works from later quotations is that quoted material sometimes will have been reworked, so that it no longer represents the original form of the text. The progress of Arab historiography, wherein “the short and simple khabar... evolved in the hands of the historian into the much easier and more manageable historical narrative”, proves a serious obstacle in the way of reconstructing original works. Among other things, this evolution meant a rather free handling of the original texts, which involved omissions, additions, the blending of material from various origins, and stylistic adjustments. The historians’ world views, interests, biases, imagination, and even ignorance played their part in the reshap-
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In addition, different handling by different historians brought about a situation in which the material ascribed to a given author in one source differs, sometimes significantly, from its parallels in other sources. The reconstructor may find it difficult to determine which version is the closest to the original. These points are illustrated in the work of Leder and Conrad. Sprenger had already noticed that al-Wâqidî’s material as quoted by al-Tabarî is not identical with al-Wâqidî’s text as edited by Von Kremer. The same phenomenon has been observed regarding other medieval authors, and several scholars have tried to account for it. Rosenthal explained it as the outcome of corrections and additions introduced either by the authors themselves or by later scholars and copyists. Rotter too considered the possibility of additions and changes introduced into al-Madâ’inî’s material by the author himself and by his transmitters. However, Rotter assigned to oral transmission the primary responsibility for the rise of the various recensions of al-Madâ’inî’s works.

Indeed, some scholars hold that the various versions of one and the same text prove that, contrary to F. Sezgin’s theory, oral tradition was prevalent in the early stages of Muslim scholarship. Their argument is that, had the quotations been derived from written codified sources, no such variations could have occurred. Schoeler, however, lays the emphasis on oral transmission rather than oral tradition. Whether or not the material was committed to writing, the preferable mode of teaching was the oral one. In this mode of teaching, the author or one of the students lectured, or read aloud, while the other students listened, and sometimes took notes. Naturally their notes were not identical, and thus different versions of the same material came into existence. Sometimes the students were not allowed to take notes.

56 Cf. Rotter, “Überlieferung”, 114, 125, 128; Rosenthal, Technique, 44-5; Hoenerbach, Wathîma, 236-40; Bellamy, “Sources”, 3. This is in contrast with U. Sezgin in Abî Mîkhnaf, where the accuracy of the Muslim scholars is emphasized.
60 Rosenthal, Technique, 30-34.
63 Ibid., 227; before him, Pedersen, The Arabic Book, chap. 3, esp. 24-27.
during lectures, so they wrote down what they remembered later, which enhanced the possibility of variations. In addition, the teachers/authors themselves probably corrected and reshaped their material, and even when authors such as Ibn Ishq gave final forms to their books, they continued to teach them orally, thus giving rise again to various recensions. 64 Schoeler’s theory thus holds oral transmission to be the main culprit for the rise of variant texts.

Following this line of thought, one should consider passages that were quoted in the wijada method to be more reliable and convenient for the purpose of reconstruction. 65 In this method no oral transmission was involved in the handing down of the material. An author simply copied from books that he had at his disposal, so that the circumstance of multiple pens or minds reproducing multiple versions was absent. Thus Rotter believed that the passages which al-Ṭabarî derived directly from al-Madâ‘inî’s books were more authentic than the material that he received by oral transmission. 66 This approach is criticized by Schoeler on the ground that authenticity has little to do with the oral or written state of the material. Written material may also be forged, or changed in good faith, by omissions, addition, and reshaping. 67 This argument is of course correct, and the fact is well-known in itself. But it seems to me that it is not sufficiently taken into account where the reconstruction of lost works is concerned. In a footnote, Schoeler observes that the Arab historians did not have in mind the reconstruction of sources; they cared for authentic material and reliable sources, but not for literal precision. 68 This important observation should be borne in mind whenever the reproduction of a lost work is attempted. The survey of the two major problems connected with reconstruction shows that the mere collection of quotations is not enough to guarantee the recovery of an original work. In the following pages I should like to illustrate this statement with reference to specific texts. For this purpose I shall examine the sections on the ridda wars in the works of the historians

64 Schoeler, “Schriftliche”, 204-12, 224. Books continued to be transmitted orally centuries after they had been codified, see Sprenger, “Notes”, 55, 59; Vajda, “Idjâza”; Samarrâ‘î, “Al-ijâza”.
65 On wijâda see Sprenger, “Notes”, 53-4; GÅS, I, 59-60.
68 Ibid., 227, note 111.
al-Diyārbakrī, al-Kalā‘î, and Ibn Ḥubaysh. Attention will also be drawn to the terminology of transmission used by these authors. It will be shown that, contrary to F. Sezgin’s conclusion, this terminology cannot always be trusted to reflect the real channels of transmission, a fact that has some bearing on the accuracy of the transmitted texts.

Al-Diyārbakrī

The faqîh and historian Husayn b. Muḥammad al-Diyārbakrī lived in Mecca in the tenth/sixteenth century (d. 966/1559, or 982/1574). His book Ta‘ríkh al-khamís fi ahwâl anfas nafîs is a compilation of materials concerning the life of Muhammad, appended by a short history of the caliphates from Abū Bakr to the Mamluks in Egypt. According to al-Diyārbakrī’s own statement in his introduction, he acquired all his material from written sources with no intermediate transmitters, that is, he utilized the wijâda method. He does not seem to have reworked the material, because the book is atomistically structured and has the appearance of a conglomerate of items placed together from a variety of sources. Al-Diyārbakrī appears to indicate the beginning of each quotation with a reference to its source, using the following terms:

1. The preposition ṣâr, “in”, followed by a book title, as in wa-ṣâr al-mawāhib al-laduniyya, or dhakara/dhukira ṣâr (“he stated/it was stated in.....) Occasionally ṣâr is followed by the name of an author, as in wa-ṣâr al-Bukhārī...
2. The verb qâla, “he said”, or dhakara, “he stated”, followed by the name of an authority, as in qâla Ibn Isâq...or qâla Ibn Jarîr...
3. The preposition ‘an, “from”, or “on the authority of”, followed by the name of an authority, for example: ‘an Ibn al-Kalbî, or ‘an Ibn ʿAbbâs.

69 Al-Diyārbakrī, Ta‘rikh; al-Kalā‘î, Ta‘rikh; Ibn Ḥubaysh, Kitāb al-ghazawāt. I used the Leiden manuscript of the Kitab al-ghazawāt, to which I had to supply the page numbering. The references to the pages of the edited text are added in parentheses.
71 See Zaydán, Ta‘rikh, III, 308.
72 The Cairo edition contains about 900 pages in two volumes; about 700 of these are sîra, the rest is the short history.
Sometimes combined references occur, such as *wa-fi al-Ḥadāʾiq 'an Abī Hurayra...* ("and in the Ḥadāʾiq, on the authority of Abū Hurayra..."). Such references indicate both al-Diyārbakrî’s immediate sources and the authorities to whom the material is ultimately ascribed.

Most of the time, however, mention of the immediate sources is omitted, and reference is made directly to the ultimate authorities. This means that in the *Taʾrikh al-khamīs* not every indication of a source (*wa-fi*, or *qāla*, or ‘*an*) marks the beginning of a direct quotation. Moreover, whole series of such indirect quotations are usually taken from one and the same immediate source, which may be mentioned at the beginning of the series. Consequently, Rosenthal’s general statement that “there could hardly ever be any doubt as to the beginning of a quotation” should be modified. 73 Al-Diyārbakrî incorporated into the text what we may call second- (or third- etc.) hand quotations. When he wrote *wa-ʾan Abī Hurayra*, without an immediately preceding indication of a source, the quotations are obviously second-hand; they were not copied from a book written by Abū Hurayra, but from later (unspecified) sources. It is much less obvious, but no less true, that al-Diyārbakrî’s text is full of second-hand quotations from books.

In the section on the *ridda* reference is made several times to authors of the second century A. H. One could conclude that al-Diyārbakrî, in the late tenth/sixteenth century, consulted these early books, a view advocated by Sachau when he suggests that al-Diyārbakrî made use of the now-lost *Maghdūzī* of Mūsā ibn ‘Uqba, which is cited in the main (*sūra*) part of the *Taʾrikh al-khamīs*. 74 However, the quotations from these early authorities were not taken directly from books written by them, but from much later works, in this case the *Kitāb al-iktīfā* by al-Kalāʾī (d. 634/1237).

A full collation of the *ridda* texts in the *Taʾrikh al-khamīs* and the *Iktīfā* demonstrates that al-Diyārbakrî copied most of al-Kalāʾī’s material on the *ridda*, including the headings of the chapters and even the critical remark, “the first version is more correct” (*wa-l-awwal athbat*). 75 Included in the copied material are al-Kalāʾī’s references to

---

the early sources, and al-Diyārbakrī only once indicates that his references are second-hand: “and in the Iktifā’, on the authority of Ibn Ishāq...”. 76 In all other cases the references are made directly to the ultimate authorities, and the name of the immediate source (i.e. al-Kalā’ī’s Iktifā’) is omitted. This was neither an unusual nor a late practice. As Leder has shown, this technique was already applied in the third/ninth century. 77 Yet it often passes unnoticed.

The references which al-Diyārbakrī copied from al-Kalā’ī are to the following authors and books:

1. Ibn Ishāq
2. the book of Ya’qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhārī
3. al-Kalbī
4. the book of al-Wāqidī (that is, his Kitāb al-ridda)
5. the book of Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī.

The following table shows the references (page:line) as they occur in the two texts: 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Diyārbakrī, II</th>
<th>Al-Kalā’ī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī al-iktifā’ qāla Ibn Ishāq/qāla Ibn Ishāq</td>
<td>201:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-dhakara Ibn Ishāq</td>
<td>203:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāla Ibn Ishāq</td>
<td>207:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-dhakara Ibn Ishāq</td>
<td>207:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-dhakara Ya’qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhārī</td>
<td>201:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī kitāb Ya’qūb al-Zuhārī</td>
<td>207:16 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī kitāb al-Zuhārī</td>
<td>207:26-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī kitāb Ya’qūb al-Zuhārī</td>
<td>220:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fīmā dhakara hu al-Kalbī ‘an ba’d al-ṣū‘iyūn</td>
<td>206:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī kitāb al-Wāqidī min qawl ‘Umar</td>
<td>202:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-dhakara al-Wāqidī ‘an Ibn ‘Umar</td>
<td>206:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-huwa mā dhakara hu al-Wāqidī ‘an ‘Umayla</td>
<td>207:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Wāqidī ‘an Ya’qūb ibn Zayd (Yazīd)</td>
<td>207:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-dhakara al-Wāqidī</td>
<td>211:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāla al-Wāqidī</td>
<td>212:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawāhu al-Wāqidī</td>
<td>213:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa-fī kitāb Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd</td>
<td>211:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76 Al-Diyārbakrī, II, 201.
77 Leder, “Features”, 76-83; idem, Korpus, 141-95. Cf. Hoenerbach, Wathīma, 227, 236; Rosenthal, Technique, 43-44.
78 For a full collation of these texts (the sections on the ridda) see appendix A.
79 Here al-Diyārbakrī erroneously writes “Aḥī Ya’qūb al-Zuhārī”.
80 Here al-Kalā’ī has two disparate traditions from Ibn ‘Umar, separated by the words wa-‘anhu qāla, see below, next page.
It is noteworthy that al-Diyârbakrî copied the references as they were, including the formula wa-fi kitâb, which he also used to indicate his own immediate sources. In the case of the second-century authors this formula is misleading, because it conveys a strong, but false, impressions of first-hand quotations.

Although al-Diyârbakrî drew heavily on the Iktifà', his work is not a replica of al-Kalâ'î's. First, he occasionally broke al-Kalâ'î’s continuous narrative in order to insert glosses and variants from other books. These interruptions, together with the copied references mentioned above, give the text its atomistic structure. Secondly, although al-Diyârbakrî rarely made abridgments and paraphrases, he often omitted passages that he seems to have regarded as not essential to the story. But, although the stories were not affected, the text itself was transformed, and for the purpose of reconstruction this observation is important. Sometimes a slight omission results in a relatively significant textual change. For instance, al-Kalâ’î arranges two accounts from Ibn ‘Umar in succession, separating them with the words wa-‘anhu qâla, “and also ascribed to him are the following words...”.

The passage runs as follows:

Al-Wâqîdî relates an account attributed to Ibn ‘Umar: “I watched the flag of Tulayhâ on that day; it was red, carried by one of their men who never let go. I watched Khalîd attack and kill him, whereupon they were defeated. I watched the flag being trampled by the camels and horses and men until it was hacked to pieces.” And also ascribed to him are the following words (wa-‘anhu qâla): “God have mercy upon Khalîd b. al-Walîd, he was courageous and adequate. I saw him at the battle against Tulayhâ, where he joined in the fighting himself until he was rebuked for it” (that is, for endangering himself)...

In al-Kalâ’î’s text it is evident that the first of these two accounts is quoted from al-Wâqîdî, the author of a book on the ridda wars. The second account in this passage could have been taken from another source, since wa-‘anhu qâla clearly refers to the purported eyewit-

81 E.g. al-Diyârbakrî, II, 205:13-20.
82 Al-Kalâ’î, 35:1-7.
ness, Ibn ‘Umar, and not to al-Wâqîdî. Incidentally, it appears from al-Kalâ’î’s source, Ibn Ḥubaysh, that the two accounts were indeed taken from al-Wâqîdî, but in all probability they did not originally occur in succession. Al-Kalâ’î still retained the original independence of the two traditions by separating them with wa-‘anhu qa‘la, but when al-Diyârbakrî copied from al-Kalâ’î he omitted these two words, together with the line that follows. The result is that the two originally disparate passages became one continuous account.

Several conclusions may be drawn from the collation of the texts on the ridda in the books of al-Diyârbakrî and al-Kalâ’î:

1. Al-Diyârbakrî apparently never set eyes on the original books of Ibn Iṣḥāq, al-Kalbī, al-Zuhrî or al-Umawī, or on the Kitâb al-ridda by al-Wâqîdî. Since al-Diyârbakrî also copied the formula wa-fī kitâb, “and in the book of...”, his terminology of transmission gives no clue to his immediate sources. But such a clue is provided by his introduction to the Taʾrîkh al-khamīs, which proves that he had no fraudulent intentions. In his introductory list of sources al-Diyârbakrî includes al-Kalâ’î’s Iktifā’, and makes no claim to have used any of the above-mentioned early sources directly. It therefore cannot be argued on the basis of the Taʾrîkh al-khamīs that in the tenth/sixteenth century all these early works were available in their original form as independent texts. Other late works that refer to early texts should be similarly examined in order to determine whether or not their references are first-hand.

2. Second-hand quotations are likely to be further removed from the original text than direct quotations, although the latter too may of course be reshaped and transformed. With second-hand quotations even slight adjustments made in good faith may accumulate so as to bring about a transformation of the original.

3. Generally speaking, in order to reconstruct lost works from later sources it is preferable to use material that is atomistically structured. Such material supposedly preserves the original form of the texts incorporated in it, whereas the continuous narrative reflects the

86 Cf. Hoenerbach, Wathîma, 236.
reworking made by the later author. This rule does not apply to the Taʾrikh al-khamīs. Here the atomistic structure results not from the piecing together of isolated original units, but from the breaking up of former continuous narratives (al-Kalāʾiʾs Iktifāʾ being one of them). If anything could be reconstructed from al-Diyārbakrīʾs text, it would not be the second-century sources he mentions, but rather the book which he directly used, that is, the Kitāb al-iktifāʾ. As it happens, the Iktifāʾ is extant.

Al-Kalāʾiʾ

Sulaymān b. Mūsā al-Kalāʾiʾ was a man of letters, poet, orator, and a scholar of hadīth, rijāl, and history. He lived in Islamic Spain, where, at the age of 70, he died in battle against the Christians in 634/1237. Of his numerous books none seems to have survived except the Kitāb al-iktifāʾ fī magḥāzī al-muṣṭafā wa-l-thalāṭa al-khulāfaʾ, which is a history of the campaigns of the Prophet and the first three caliphs. The text is in the main a continuous story with occasional references to sources.

Only two parts of the Iktifāʾ have hitherto been published, each of them twice. The volume on the sīra was published by Henri Massē, and by Muṣṭafāʾ Abūl-Wāḥīd. The part on the ridda was published by Khurshīd Fāriq, under the title Taʾrīkh al-ridda, and by Ahmad Ghunaym, under the title Al-khilāfa al-rashida wa-l-buṭūla al-khālida fī ṭurūb al-ridda. All four editors attach great value to the Kitāb al-iktifāʾ as a repository of lost early works, and Miklos Muranyi considers the book a possible source for the reconstruction of the Kitāb al-ridda of al-Wāqīdī. According to Fāriq and Ghunaym, al-Kalāʾiʾ not only used second-century sources directly but also stated the fact in his introduction. Ghunaym mentions in this con-

Bellamy, “Sources”, 3.
Ghunaym was not aware of Fāriqʾs edition, and repeats his claim that he was the first to publish the volume, see his introduction, 7, 8, 22.
connection the “lost book about the ridda” by Ibn Ishāq, the likewise-lost book of al-Wāqīdī on the ridda, the writings of Ya’qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī and Yahyā ibn Sa’īd al-Umawī, as well as a lost book whose author is semi anonymous...i.e. Wathîma ibn Mûsâ’s Kitâb al-ridda”. 92 Fâriq writes that al-Kalâ‘î recorded otherwise-unknown details “from sources which are still unknown/unavailable, and which are perhaps (irretrievably) lost”. According to Fâriq, al-Kalâ‘î named a few of these sources in his introduction, as follows:

1. The book of al-Wâqīdī; this is how the author referred to it. There is no doubt that what is meant is al-Wâqīdī’s Kitâb al-ridda, mentioned by Ibn al-Nadîm.
2. The book of Ya’qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī...
3. The book of al-Umawī; perhaps this refers to Yahyā ibn Sa’īd al-Umawī, d. AH 194...
4. The Kitâb al-ridda by Wathîma... 93

These statements by Ghunaym and Fâriq seem to be wrong. In the introduction to the Iktifâ’, as recorded in the two editions of the first volume, as well as in Fâriq’s own introduction, 94 al-Kalâ‘î never mentions any of these books. Although he lists Ibn Ishāq (or rather Ibn Hishâm), al-Wâqīdī’s Kitâb al-mab’ath, and Mûsâ ibn ‘Uqba among his sources for the sîra, he draws his material on the ridda from late sources. These are, to quote his own words, “the book of our shaykh, the khatîb Abû al-Qâsim, and other similar works”. 95 By “the book of our shaykh” he means the Kitâb al-ghazawât of his teacher ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn Ḥubaysh. 96 As in al-Diyārbakrî’s case, we may rely on the integrity of the author. Al-Kalâ‘î never refers in the text to Ibn Ḥubaysh as his immediate source, but he does acknowledge him in the introduction. On the other hand, while he does occasionally refer in the text to second-century sources, these are not mentioned in his introduction. The reason

92 Al-Kalâ‘î, ed. Ghunaym, 8-9.
94 Ibid., 3-8.
96 Fâriq seems not to be aware of this book; he refers to it as “an unnamed work of his teacher Khaṭīb Abû l-Qâsim”, see Fâriq, “A valuable manuscript”, 164.
for this is, apparently, that al-Kalâ’î did not include in his list of sources books that he had not seen and used himself. In other words, the references to these second-century sources are second-hand, copied from the direct source, Ibn Ḥubaysh. As for the general definition “other similar works” which al-Kalâ’î recorded in his list of sources, the proposition that it refers to the ancient books mentioned in the text is untenable, as will be demonstrated below.

The majority of the passages which al-Kalâ’î quoted on the ridda from second-century sources is traceable to the Kitâb al-ghazawât of his teacher Ibn Ḥubaysh. Needless to say, al-Kalâ’î’s references to even older authorities and eyewitnesses, which Fâriq interprets as indicating that he used “virgin sources”, 97 were all derived from Ibn Ḥubaysh. From the total of 74 references made by al-Kalâ’î, there are only eight which I could not locate in the Kitâb al-ghazawât: two passages from Wathïma ibn Mūsa, whom Ibn Ḥubaysh never cites; one passage from Sayf ibn ‘Umar, whom Ibn Ḥubaysh does not cite on the ridda; two passages from Ibn Ishâq; two from Ibn ‘Umar, and one from Ḍamra ibn Sa’īd. 98 That al-Kalâ’î did not directly use the second-century sources on the ridda is thus proven both by his own introductory statement and by the text itself. Not only are the majority of references traceable to Ibn Ḥubaysh, but al-Kalâ’î also sometimes reproduced from the book of his teacher series of narratives, preserving the same arrangement of the material. 99 Obviously, had al-Kalâ’î used the early sources himself, he could not have chosen precisely the same fragments as did Ibn Ḥubaysh, let alone put them in precisely the same order.

Although al-Kalâ’î drew heavily on Ibn Ḥubaysh, the part on the ridda in the Iktifâ’ is not merely a copy of the Ghazawât. More often than not, al-Kalâ’î preserved neither the original arrangement nor the atomistic structure of his source, but rather integrated the isolated units recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh into a continuous narrative. To achieve this continuity al-Kalâ’î employed various means, such as paraphrase, omissions of variants, additions of sentences that supply the background or the finale of originally fragmentary narrative units,

97 Ibid.
and omission of references to sources. Occasionally, references were retained, but even so, there is no way to tell where the quotations end. Needless to say, the original material is greatly transformed. Examples of this process follow.

1. Ibn Hubaysh reproduced from the book of Ya’qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhri an account of the beginning of the ridda (A1). Immediately following is a variant account on the authority of two tābi‘īn, derived apparently from the same book (A2). According to the A1 account, several Arab tribes refused to pay the zakāt after Muḥammad’s death, adducing various pretexts. At that time, Abū Bakr intended to send the Muslim army away from Medina to raid Syria. The Companions, feeling threatened by the Arab tribes, tried to dissuade Abū Bakr from carrying out his plan, and the caliph delivered a speech in reply. The strongest opposition to Abū Bakr came from ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū ʿUbayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ and Sālim, mawla of Abū Ḥudhayfa. The second account (A2) has it that Arab tribal leaders came to Medina announcing the refusal of their tribes to pay the zakāt. Two of these leaders offered to prevent their tribes from rebelling against Islam in return for compensation, and the Companions attempted to convince Abū Bakr to accept this proposal. Abū Bakr delivered a speech in reply. It is noteworthy that parts of the speech are identical with the speech in the preceding account (A1).

To these two accounts Ibn Ḥubaysh appended two passages, which reflect the two sides of the argument. Each is preceded by a reference to its source, which is in both cases the Kitāb al-ridda of al-Wāqidī. The first passage (B1) is an isolated sentence, purportedly spoken by Abū Bakr in his reply to the Companions. The second (B2) consists of statements by Abu Bakr’s opponents: B2a) ʿUmar’s argument in favour of accepting the tribes’ proposals, and B2b) the argument of the strongest opposition to Abū Bakr, in favour of retaining the Muslim army in Medina.

From these disparate elements al-Kalā’ī created one continuous story, interrupted only once by a reference to a source. He begins with a reference to al-Zuhri and a reproduction of part of A1: several Arab

---

100 Cf. above.
101 On al-Zuhri see below.
102 See Tabari, Taʾrīkh, III, 185 and 223-7.
tribes refused to pay the zakāt, adducing various pretexts. The Com­
panions argued with Abū Bakr. Here al-Kalā‘ī integrates the words
spoken by the strongest opposition, as available to him in B2b. The
reference to the source of this passage, i.e. al-Wāqidī, is omitted. The
result is that a unit from al-Wāqidī appears as part of al-Zuhri’s narra­
tive. To this al-Kalā‘ī appends ‘Umar’s words, as given in B2a,
this time together with the reference to al-Wāqidī. He then resumes
al-Zuhri’s narrative, A2, without indicating that he is doing so. The
result is that A2 appears to be a continuation of al-Wāqidī’s account.
To Abu Bakr’s speech, which apparently was originally taken from
al-Zuhri (A2), al-Kalā‘ī adds the isolated sentence supplied by
al-Wāqidī (B1), again without any indication of what he is doing.
Al-Kalā‘ī thus selected pieces from Ibn Ḥubaysh’s text and recast
them into one story, blending material from two different sources.
Any reconstruction of either al-Wāqidī or al-Zuhri based on the
Iktifā’ will therefore be misleading.

2. Under the title of fi ḥadith ghayrihi, “in the account of some­
one else”, al-Kalā‘ī opens a narrative with a sentence, taken out of its
context, from a tradition originally transmitted by Ishāq b. Yahyā. He
continues the story uninterruptedly with a narrative from al-Wāqidī’s
book, omitting mention of the source.

3. Ibn Ḥubaysh records two distinct traditions about two differ­
ent arguments between the people of the tribe of Tayy and their
leader, ‘Adi ibn Ḥātim. One of these traditions is recorded on the au­
thority of Ibn Ishāq, the other on the authority of al-Sha’bī (d.
105/723). Al-Kalā‘ī copies the reference to Ibn Ishāq and (with slight
abridgements) the first account; to this he appends an abridgement of
al-Sha’bī’s story, without mentioning the source, representing it as a
fragmentary variant of the preceding tradition. He thus makes two
different events appear as one.

The examination of al-Kalā‘ī’s text leads to several conclusions:

1. As in al-Diyārbakrī’s case, the references to sources in the text
cannot be taken as indicating the author’s immediate authorities, even

105 See appendix C.
when he uses the formula *wa-fî kitâb*, “and in the book of...”. Contrary to the claims of Fārîq and Ghunaym, al-Kalâ‘î never had at his disposal the *Kitâb al-ridda* of al-Wâqidî and the books of al-Umawî and al-Zuhrî, but rather copied the references to them from Ibn Ḥubaysh. As for the books of Wathîma and Sayf, it seems likely that al-Kalâ‘î did not directly use them, because he did not include them in his bibliography. However, he does not seem to have cited them from Ibn Ḥubaysh’s *Ghazawât* either.

2. Contrary to the assumption advanced by the editors of the *Iktifâ*, as well as by Muranyî, this book is not to be trusted for the reconstruction of al-Wâqidî’s *Kitâb al-ridda* or any other lost source. Admittedly, the *Iktifâ* contains even much more material from al-Wâqidî and al-Zuhrî than is apparent to the reader. The difficulty is that this material cannot be identified, first, because the references to the sources are in most cases omitted, and second, because the material has been reworked and hence hardly represents the original form of the text. All this comes to light through the collation of the *Iktifâ* with the *Kitâb al-ghazawât* of Ibn Ḥubaysh.

**Ibn Ḥubaysh**

The scholar ‘Abd al-Raḥmân b. Muḥammad b. Ṭâlîf b. Yūsuf ibn Ḥubaysh was an Andalusian of the sixth/twelfth century who gained his reputation mainly in the field of hadîth. He acted as orator (*khatīb*) and judge to the Muwâḥhid sultans ‘Abd al-Mu‘min (524-58/1130-63) and Abû Ya‘qûb Yūsuf (558-80/1163-84, and was commissioned by the latter to compose the *Kitâb al-ghazawât wa-l-futûḥ*, a compilation of material on the Muslim conquests during the reign of the first three caliphs. The book has a direct connection with the ideology and political program of the Muwâḥhidîs. Abû Ya‘qûb in particular was constantly at war with the Christians in al-Andalus, and it was in order to heighten the morale of his armies

---

108 E.g. al-Kalâ‘î, 4:3.
110 Dunlop, 360; Ibn Ḥubaysh, 5. See also Huici Miranda, “Abû Yûsuf Ya‘qûb”.
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that he sought to have assembled the stories that illustrated the heroic Muslim past.  

Two manuscripts of the Kitāb al-ghazawāt are known to exist, and parts of the work were already utilized by Caetani.  

An incomplete edition in four volumes, based on both manuscripts, has been published by Ahmad Ghunaym in Cairo.

Unlike his pupil al-Kalā’ī, Ibn Ḥubaysh did not apply the blending technique, so that the Kitāb al-ghazawāt consists of successive narrative units, each preceded by an indication of a source. In his introduction Ibn Ḥubaysh provides a surprisingly short list of sources, which includes the following: “the Kitāb al-ridda of Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqīdī and other [books]” (kitāb al-ridda li-Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqīdī wa-ghayrihi), the Ta'rīkh of al-Ṭabarî, the Kitāb al-ridda wa-l-futūḥ by Sayf b. ‘Umar, and the book entitled Futūḥ al-Shām, the provenance of which, says Ibn Ḥubaysh, is uncertain. It is worthy of note that Ibn Ḥubaysh mentions both al-Ṭabarî and Sayf, because most of al-Ṭabarî’s material on this period, that is, the ridda wars and the conquests (futūḥ), was drawn from Sayf.

Oddly enough, Ibn Ḥubaysh never cites Sayf on the ridda. Caetani interpreted this fact as indicating Ibn Ḥubaysh’s distrust in Sayf, which in turn seemed to support his view that the Medinan school (in this case, mainly al-Wāqīdī) was more reliable than the Iraqī school (in this case, Sayf). This interpretation is disproved by the fact that Ibn Ḥubaysh does include Sayf in his introductory list of sources and draws on him heavily for futūḥ accounts. The reason why he left Sayf out of the ridda part of his book may be that he wished to minimize contradiction among his reports. Ibn Ḥubaysh’s intention was not to produce a genuine reconstruction of the past, but to set forth a paradigm of heroic behavior, a purpose which would not be well served

111 The Muwahhids also called upon traditionists to collect traditions about jihād, which were to be studied before setting out for war. See al-Marrākushi, Al-Mu'jīb, 183. I thank Dr. Larry Conrad for this reference.

112 Caetani, Annali, II, Introduction, xxi, and 550 n. 70. For details of the mss., see Dozy, Catalogus, II, 158-9, n. 779 (=Warner 343, used in this article), and Ahlwardt, Verzeichniss, IX, 221-2, n. 9689. See also Ibn Ḥubaysh, ed. Ghunaym, Introduction, 16-7.

113 See note 69 above.


115 Caetani, Annali, II, 550, n. 70. On the problematic nature of Sayf’s traditions, see Noth, “Charakter”; Landau-Tasseron, “Sayf”. 
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by reports which contradicted one another. It is noteworthy that although Ibn Ḥubaysh often records variants, these are seldom fundamentally at odds with each other, whereas Sayf’s traditions (as we know them from al-Ṭabarî) draw a picture of the *ridda* which is very different from that offered in the other sources.

Not only Sayf, but also al-Ṭabarî is passed over in silence by Ibn Ḥubaysh in his account of the *ridda*, and there is perhaps only one passage which may have been excerpted from al-Ṭabarî’s *Ta’rîkh*. Thus Ibn Ḥubaysh’s sources on the *ridda* were “the *Kitāb al-ridda* of al-Wâqidî and others [books]”, which remain unspecified. The references in the text of the *Kitāb al-ghazawât* do not correspond to the list of sources given in the introduction, except when the reference is to al-Wâqidî. As opposed to the al-Kalâ‘î’s “in the book of”; Ibn Ḥubaysh’s “other books”, which he mentions in his bibliography, seem to refer to the several works which he cites in the text. In other words, his quotations from several early books are first-hand. The reason for this conclusion will be clarified below.

Ibn Ḥubaysh’s references may be divided into two categories, according to his own terminology. First, there are the numerous quotations which he introduces with the terms “*an*, “on the authority of”*, qāla*, “he said”, *dhakara/dhukira* ‘*an*, “he stated/it is stated on the authority of...”, and rarely *wa-fi hadîth*, “and in the account of...” In many cases, these terms are followed by names of Companions and eyewitnesses (or their descendants); such accounts are second- (or third- etc.) hand quotations. Successors (*tābi‘ūn*) and still later authorities are also referred to by these formulae. It is most probable that the passages thus quoted from authors such as al-Sha‘bî, ‘Abdallâh b. Abî Bakr b. Ḥazm (d. 130/747), al-Kalbî (d. 146/763), Abû Ma‘shar (d. 170/786) and others are also second-hand quotations, in particular when they occur within sequences which also include Companions and eyewitnesses. Indeed, Ibn Ḥubaysh explic-
itly cites Abū Ma‘shar from the book of al-Dūlābī, and there is one passage from (‘an) al-Sha‘bī that was evidently excerpted from the book of Ya‘qūb al-Zuhri. The second category of references is the (less numerous) quotations which Ibn Ḥubaysh introduces with the words wa-fi kitāb..., “and in the book of...” This term opens quotations both from al-Wāqidī’s Kitāb al-ridda and from other books that are not specified in the introduction. This is why I conclude that the phrase “Kitāb al-ridda and other books” covers Ibn Ḥubaysh’s direct sources for the ridda wars. The Kitāb al-ridda of al-Wāqidī, however, is an exception, not only because the book is both listed in the introduction and mentioned in the text, but also because Ibn Ḥubaysh often quotes it with the formulae qāla, ‘an, and dhakara al-Wāqidī, instead of wa-fi kitāb al-Wāqidī. This exception notwithstanding, Ibn Ḥubaysh seems to be deliberately using distinctive terminology in order to differentiate between first- and second-hand material, that is, between quotations from his direct sources and references copied therefrom. The latter are mostly designated by the terms ‘an, etc. whereas wa-fi kitāb apparently indicates the books that served as his direct sources. These are the following:

1. the Šahīḥ of Muslim (d. 261/875)
2. the Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh of Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī (d. 320/932)
3. the Maghāzī of Ibn Iṣḥāq
4. a book by Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Umawī (d. 194/809)

There is no reason to doubt that Ibn Ḥubaysh directly used these five books, because none of his references to them was taken from any of the four sources mentioned in the introduction (al-Wāqidī’s Ridda, al-Ṭabarī’s Ta‘rīkh, Sayf’s Kitāb al-ridda wa-l-futūḥ and the book enti-

does not of course mean that Ibn Ḥubaysh transmitted from Abū Ma‘shar, who died centuries earlier. The phrase was obviously copied by Ibn Ḥubaysh from al-Wāqidī, who transmitted directly from Abū Ma‘shar. See GAS, I, 291. There are, however, cases where qāla does precede quotations from a book, see next page, and below.

119 Ibn Ḥubaysh, 62:16 (=ed. I, 160), see also below.
120 Ibn Ḥubaysh, 26:4 (=ed. I, 66). The sources for the other passages transmitted by al-Sha‘bī (15:8, 78:11 =ed. I, 38, 198), as well as for traditions from al-Kalbī and others, are not explicitly stated.
tled *Futūh al-Shām*). These five books are not cited in al-Ṭabarî, they are not likely to have been cited in any version of the *Futūh al-Shām* (which does not deal with the *ridda*), and they are not likely to have been cited by Sayf, because Sayf was either contemporary with or earlier than the authors of these books. Also, the style, method, and content of this material have nothing in common with Sayf’s accounts as we know them. Furthermore, there is nothing to indicate the existence of yet another direct source used, but concealed, by Ibn Ḥubaysh. Whereas al-Kalā’î made it clear that he copied his references to the older sources (by stating that his immediate source was Ibn Ḥubaysh, not these older sources), Ibn Ḥubaysh gives no such indication, and his application of the formula *wa-ft kitāb* seems to be genuine. The fact that he did not hesitate to explicitly cite the second century authors, al-Sha’bî and Abū Ma’shar, from later sources, shows that he did not wish to pretend that he had used the ancient sources directly. Here I should like to comment on the works that Ibn Ḥubaysh did use directly.

**Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim**

Ibn Ḥubaysh refers to this famous *ḥadīth* scholar only once, quoting the *ḥadīth* that served as the *casus belli* of the *ridda*. The *ḥadīth* is woven into a historical narrative which depicts the discussion between Abū Bakr and ‘Umar concerning the payment of the *zakāt*. *Fiqh, ḥadīth* and historical literature abound with parallel versions of this *ḥadīth*.

**Al-Dūlâbî**

Like Muslim, Abū Bishr al-Dūlâbî is quoted only once, but the quotation seems to be of some importance. The reference is to the *Book of History* by Abū Bishr al-Dūlâbî, and at the end of the quotation there is a mark and a comment that the original has been abridged. Al-Dūlâbî was a *muḥaddith* and historian who lived

---

2. See Kister, “illā bi-ḥaqqaḥiḥi”.
3. Ibn Ḥubaysh, 62:16-63:19 (=ed. I, 160-3). This is the only time that Ibn Ḥubaysh indicates an abridgement.
most of his long life (224-320/838-932) in Rayy and Cairo. His biographers inform us that he wrote books, but they adduce only two titles: the Kitāb al-kunā wa-l-asmā’ and Al-dhuriyya al-țâhira al-mu-țahhara. The latter apparently deals with the family of the Prophet, whereas the former (published in Hyderabad, AH1323) is a collection of the agnomens (kunyās) of the Companions and Successors. No Kitāb al-ta’rīkh by Abū Bishr is known to his biographers. It is of course possible that Ibn Ḥubaysh copied from the Kitāb al-kunā wa-l-asmā’, referring to it by the generic name Ta’rīkh, but this is hardly likely, since this book does not seem to be a ta’rīkh in any sense of the word. There is, however, a possibility that Ibn Ḥubaysh quoted from another book of al-Dūłābī, which was not widely known. The passage in question consists of a list of Qurashīs and Anṣārīs who were killed in the battle of Yamāma, and is cited by al-Dūłābī on the authority of the historian Abū Ma’shar (d. 170/786). Such lists are more characteristic of historical works than of books such as the Al-kunā wa-l-asmā’. Al-Dūłābī was also known to the Egyptian Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Kindī (d. 350/961), author of the Kitāb al-wulât wa-kitāb al-qudāt. Al-Kindī directly transmitted from al-Dūłābī two anecdotes, one of which contains historical information. Much more evidence is needed before deciding whether or not al-Dūłābī should be credited with a Kitāb al-ta’rīkh, but this one quotation in the Kitāb al-ghazawāt constitutes the end of a thread that may (or may not) lead to new information.

Ibn Ishaq and al-Umawî

Ibn Išāq’s Maghāzī is quoted by Ibn Ḥubaysh once; the closing point of the quotation is not clear, because the next unit is cited from al-Sha’bī with the formula ‘an and it may (or may not) be a part of the

---

124 See GAS, I, 172 and the bibliography thereto. Several additional titles, but no Ta’rīkh, are mentioned by Ibn Khayr al-Ishbîlî, II, 470, 505, 526, 534.

125 For the meanings of ta’rīkh in titles of books see Rosenthal, History, 14-5.

126 Se e.g. Ibn Hishām, Sīra, I, 267-9, 344-5; II, 86-7, 97-110. Examples can be multiplied.

127 Al-Kindī, Wolāt, 74, 318.

quotation from Ibn Ishāq. The account quoted deals with the career of the Tā'ī leader ‘Adî b. Ḥātim, who, having been appointed tax collector by Muhammad, remained faithful to Islam when the ridda broke out and stood up against those of his people who wanted to secede. The passage is not to be found in either Ibn Hishām or al-Ṭabarī (who derived many accounts from Ibn Ishāq). Another quotation from Ibn Ishāq depicts the scene of the battle that took place between the Muslim forces and the coalition of rebels headed by the false prophet Tulayḥa (the battle of Buzākha, in the year 11/632). Here Ibn Ḥubaysh does not mention the Maghāzī or any other book, but introduces the quotation by the term ‘an, which presumably indicates second-hand quotations. It is possible that the passage was excerpted from al-Ṭabarī’s Taʾrīkh. Two justifications may be adduced for this conclusion. First, al-Ṭabarī was one of Ibn Ḥubaysh’s direct sources, and this particular account of Ibn Ishāq is recorded in the Taʾrīkh al-mulūk. Secondly, there is a partial parallelism in sequence between the texts of Ibn Ḥubaysh and al-Ṭabarī. It should be noted that the two accounts are not identical: Ibn Ḥubaysh’s version looks rather like a free rendering of the passage in al-Ṭabarī. It is shorter, omitting not only repetitions but also difficult sentences or parts thereof. The skeleton of the story in both versions, however, is identical, as are some of the key phrases. Like al-Kalāʾī and al-Diyārbakrī after him, Ibn Ḥubaysh here perhaps omitted mention of his immediate source, al-Ṭabarī, and copied the latter’s reference to his own source (Ibn Ishāq). Ibn Ḥubaysh, however, did not usually apply this method. As for the parallelism in sequence, it is partial and inconclusive as evidence, but still calls for explanation. In the text of al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Ishāq’s description of the battle of Buzākha is placed after a series of traditions from Ibn al-Kalbī. In the text of Ibn Ḥubaysh this same account (i.e. Ibn Ishāq’s, about Buzākha) is placed after two short traditions from al-Kalbī, introduced by the words wa-fi hadīth...
nately these two traditions are not to be found in al-Tabarî, so it cannot be proven by sequential evidence that Ibn Ḥubaysh drew Ibn Ṣuqūn’s account from al-Ṭabarî’s Taʾrikh. Yet this partial parallelism hardly strikes one as accidental, particularly in view of the fact that nowhere else does Ibn Ḥubaysh cite al-Kalbî or his son. Perhaps Ibn Ḥubaysh had at his disposal a version of al-Ṭabarî that contained the two al-Kalbî traditions, together with the Ibn al-Kalbî series. 135

Three other passages from Ibn Ṣuqūn occur in Ibn Ḥubaysh’s text as second-hand quotations, excerpted from the book of Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī. 136 In addition, two short statements are cited from al-Umawī which are not ascribed to Ibn Ṣuqūn. 137 All these passages from al-Umawī are immediately followed by quotations from other books (al- Wāqīdī, al-Zuhrī), so that there is no difficulty in identifying the closing of the quotations. Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Umawī was a Kūfan scholar of the second century AH (d. 194/809), who is known to have compiled a book on the maghāzī of the Prophet. 138 According to F. Sezgin, al-Umawī was quoted by al-Bukhārī, al-Ṭabarî, and Ibn Ḥajar. Sezgin’s contention (following Fāriq) that this Kitāb al-maghāzī was also used by al-Kalāʾī is not correct. As has been shown above, al-Kalāʾī copied the references to al-Umawī from Ibn Ḥubaysh. The latter, however, seems to have used al-Umawī’s book directly, judging by his methodology and by the structure of his text.

The scope and nature of al-Umawī’s work is not entirely clear to me. In the majority of the accounts cited by later sources, he quotes Ibn Ṣuqūn, but he also records material from other authorities. 139 Ibn Ḥajar cites “al-Umawī in his Maghāzī “. 140 All this points to an independent maghāzī work by al-Umawī. 141 On the other hand, Ibn Ḥajar also mentions “a copy of the Maghāzī in the recension of (rīwāyat) al-Umawī”, and, “the Maghāzī of Ibn Ṣuqūn in the recensions of Ibn

135 The series from Ibn al-Kalbî mentioned above do not go back to al-Kalbî, but to other authorities.
138 Kahhâla, Muʿjam, XIII, 199; GAS, I, 293.
139 E.g. al-Ṭabarî, Taʾrikh, III, 162, 194.
141 Ibn Ḥajar also cites “al-Umawī in the Maghāzī”, in which case the work is not necessarily al-Umawī’s own compilation; see e.g. Isāba. II, 266 (s.v. Ḥād b. Kathîr, III, 188 (s.v. Ghunaym b. Zuhayr).
Hishâm and al-Umawî”. 142 These references suggest that al-Umawî was not an author in his own right, but merely a transmitter. Indeed, he was listed by Fück as one of the fifteen transmitters of Ibn Ishâq’s Maghâzî. 143 Naturally, al-Umawî could have been both an author and a transmitter, but in that case a distinction should be made between the Maghâzî which is his own compilation and the book of the same title which is a recension of Ibn Ishâq’s work. 144 If he was not an author but merely a transmitter of Ibn Ishâq’s Maghâzî, the entries on him in the bio-bibliographical works should be corrected. Apparently, this is yet another case of the complex relation between authors and transmitters. 145

The passages which Ibn Ḥubaysh excerpted from the book of al-Umawî on the authority of Ibn Ishâq may have been taken from Ibn Ishâq’s Maghâzî, or from his Kitāb al-khulafâ’. 146 Al-Umawî was sometimes quoted on the ridda also by Ibn Ḥajar, which led Caetani to conclude that al-Umawî had compiled a book on the ridda (although such a book is not mentioned by the sources). 147 The passages quoted by Ibn Ḥubaysh seem to corroborate Caetani’s conclusion, particularly in view of the fact that Ibn Ḥubaysh constantly refers to Kitāb al-Umawî, “the book of al-Umawî”.

Al-Zuhrî

Ibn Ḥubaysh refers many times to a book by Ya’qūb ibn Muhammad al-Zuhrî for which he specifies no title. This al-Zuhrî, a descendant of the Companion ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn ‘Awf, is known as a traditionist of the second century AH (d. 213/828). Professional

142 Ibid., III, 294 (s.v. Ka‘b b. Himân); III, 390 (s.v. Makhraba b. ‘Adî). Cf. III, 192 (s.v. Ghaylan b. ‘Amr): “…al-Umawî also mentioned him in the Maghâzî of Yûnus ibn Bukayr.” Yûnus himself (d. 199/815) was a transmitter (râwî) of Ibn Ishâq’s Maghâzî, so it is not certain which work Ibn Ḥajar is quoting here.
143 Fück, Muhammad ibn Ishâq, 44.
144 As far as I am aware F. Sezgin made no such distinction, although he made the list which contains the above-mentioned references to al-Umawî in later sources.
145 See above.
146 Note that the passage quoted from Ibn Ishâq’s Maghâzî above, also deals with the ridda. On the Kitāb al-khulafâ’ see Abbott, Studies, I, 80-99.
147 E.g. Ibn Ḥajar, Isâba, I, 374 (s.v. Ḥujayl b. Qudâma); II, 50 (s.v. Sa‘îd b. ‘Adî); Caetani, Annali, II, 550, n.” 70. Hoenerbach, Wathîma, 220, shares Caetani’s conclusion.
opinions of him are generally low, although some authorities among
the muhaddithûn considered him to be reliable. 148 Hadîths transmitted
by him are sparse and hard to come by. 149 Judging by the material
ascribed to him in the Kitâb al-aghânî, little as it is, al-Zuhrî was not
only a muhaddith but also transmitted anecdotes. Muḥammad b.
Ḥabîb and al-Zubayr b. Bakkâr, who worked in the field which lies
between history and historical gossip, transmitted from him di-
rectly. 150 The material transmitted from him by Ibn Ḥubaysh com­
prises accounts of the ridda in various parts of Arabia, and has little,
if anything, to do with hadîth from and about the Prophet. The quo­
tations occur in various types of combinations, which are described be­
low:

1. A narrative unit from the book of al-Zuhrî (a), followed by a
unit from another book (b), for example: (a) wa-fî kitâb al-Zuhrî...(b)
wa-qâla/'an al-Wâqidi .... 151 The closing points of the quotations can
be clearly identified.

2. A narrative unit from al-Zuhrî (a), followed by another (b),
e.g. (a) wa-fî kitâb al-Zuhrî...(b) wa-fihi.... 152 Unit (b) may be fol­
lowed by yet another unit from al-Zuhrî, or by a quotation from an­
other book, or by material from older sources, such as eye-witnesses.
In this last case the closing of the quotation is not clear (see n° 3.
below). The impression gained from this structure is that Ibn Ḥubaysh
quoted from different places in al-Zuhrî’s book. In order to indicate
that he did not follow the original arrangement of al-Zuhrî’s narra­
tives, he inserted the phrase wa-fihi, “and in it...”, thus breaking the
continuity and avoiding the creation of a new non-original sequence.
This interpretation is based on the fact that such a pattern of citation is

148 Ibn Abî Hâtim, Jarb, IV.2, 214-5; Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, XI, 396-7; al-Khaṭîb
al-Baghdâdî, Ta’rîkh, XIV, 269-71; al-Dhahabî, Misân, III, 325.
149 For a hadîth on the merits of a certain territory in Medina see al-Ḥarbî, Manâsik,
404; I owe this reference to Prof. Amikam Elad. See also al-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, II, 156-7, a
tradition about the light that shone when the Prophet was born; al-Dûlâbî, Kunâ, 10, has
some information from this Zuhrî.
150 Al-Isfahânî, Aghânî, VIII, 122; XVI, 196; XVII, 325; XXI, 346. See also XX,
346, and al-Jâsir, Mu`allafât, 99.
39, 55, 57-8, 89-90, 100). The qi‘âl and ‘an in these cases stand for fî kitâb (except
21:24), see above.
152 E.g. ibid., 26:4-6, 37:22-25 (=ed. I, 66, 98).
neither conventional nor common, as opposed to the use of the verb *qāla* "he said". Had Ibn Ḥubaysh copied successive accounts from al-Zuhri, there would have been no need for the insertion of *wa-fīhi*, which indicates a break in continuity. The importance of this observation lies in the conclusion that Ibn Ḥubaysh did not copy al-Zuhri’s work in its entirety, yet made an effort to avoid distortion of the original arrangement of the text.

3. The most common structure of citation is a narrative unit from al-Zuhri (a), followed by one or several narrative units ascribed to older sources and/or eyewitnesses (b, c, d, etc.), as in: (a) *wa-fī kitāb Ya‘qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhri...*(b) *wa-‘an Abī Sa‘īd al-Khudrī...*(c) *wa-‘an Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab...*(d) *wa-‘an Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ‘an abīḥī...*(e) *wa-‘an Zayd ibn Ṭahlī...*(f) *wa-qāla Sālim ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Umar...*(g) *wa-fī Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh li-Abī Bishr al-Dūlābī...*. Ibn Ḥubaysh’s distinctive terminology is presumably at work here. It appears that he quotes from al-Zuhri’s book passages that consist of several successive units, indicating his immediate source (al-Zuhri) only at the beginning of the first one. The units (a)-(f), in other words, constitute one quotation from al-Zuhri, which ends where a new quotation from a book (g) occurs. This is quite obvious in cases where the name of one and the same ancient authority is repeated, as in the following sequence: (a) *qāla Ya‘qūb (i.e. al-Zuhri) bi-sanadihi ‘an ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Bakra...*(b) *wa-‘an ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Bakra (c) *wa-fī hadith ākhar qāla ‘an ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Bakra...*. In cases where the units are ascribed to various authorities, it is possible that part of the sequence was taken not from al-Zuhri’s book, but from another unspecified source. An example of such a “suspect” sequence will be considered below.

In his introduction to the *Ta‘rīkh al-ridda*, Fāriq includes al-Zuhri in the list of sources used by al-Kalā‘ī, states that al-Zuhri compiled a book on the *maghāzī*, and refers the reader to Ibn Hajar’s *Tahdhib* and al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī’s *Ta‘rīkh Baghdaḍ*. As shown above, al-Kalā‘ī never used al-Zuhri’s book directly. Ibn Ḥajar and al-Khatīb

154 I.e. ‘*an or qāla* as opposed to *fī kitāb*, although *qāla* is occasionally used to refer to a book, see above.
al-Baghdâdî in fact mention no book by al-Zuhrî, nor do other bio-bibliographical works, either classical or modern. Nevertheless, the extensive quotations preserved by Ibn Ḫubaysh, and his reference to “al-Zuhrî’s book”, probably reflect a genuine second-century text. Since Ya’qûb al-Zuhrî was neither widely known nor highly appreciated the possibility of false ascription does not seem likely.

**Al-Wâqidî**

There are a few indications that Ibn Ḫubaysh took the *Kitâb al-ridda* of al-Wâqidî as his basic source on the *ridda*, using the other books at his disposal as complementary material. First and most obvious (once the patterns of citations are clarified), this book is by far the most extensively cited source in the *Kitâb al-ghazawât*. Second, al-Wâqidî is mentioned in the introductory list of sources, whereas al-Zuhrî, who is also quoted, is not. Third, when Ibn Ḫubaysh finds that al-Wâqidî and al-Zuhrî relate similar accounts of the same event and so decides to cite only one of the two, it is the material of al-Wâqidî, not al-Zuhrî, that he chooses to use. The amount of the material which Ibn Ḫubaysh quotes from al-Wâqidî is not immediately detectable, because of the patterns of citation that he uses. These are as follows:

1. A narrative unit from al-Wâqidî (a), followed by a quotation from another book (b). This structure, in which the closing of the quotation is clear, is rare, because the quotations from al-Wâqidî usually consist of more than one narrative unit.

2. Two or more successive narrative units from al-Wâqidî. Occasionally these are introduced with the formulae (a) *wa-fî kitâb al-Wâqidî*. (b) *wa-fîhi...*. I interpret this as an indication that the two units were not originally successive. Occasionally, the original arrangement of the material is not so clear, because Ibn Ḫubaysh uses the formula *qâla* (in place of *fî kitâb*), for example: (a) *qâla al-Wâqidî qâlû* (a long composite story follows) (b) *qâla al-Wâqidî wa-ḥaddith-

---

157 Al-Zuhrî is also absent from al-Baghdâdî’s list of sources, prepared by al-ʿUmari, in his *Dirāṣāt*, 145-219.
159 E.g. *ibid.*, 20:25-27 (=ed. I, 53). See also above.

---
The word *qāla* may indicate a break in the narrative, in which case (a) and (b) were originally distinct and separate units. More often than not, however, *qāla* does not mark discontinuity, but rather functions as an indicator of the narrator’s presence in the text. Therefore, the succession of (a) and (b), which are separated by *qāla*, may well have been original.

The following series of units, on the other hand, would seem to deviate from al-Wāqidi’s original arrangement: (a) *wa-‘an al-Wāqidi...* (b) *wa-fi kitāb al-Wāqidi...* (c) *wa-qāla al-Wāqidi...* (d) *qāla al-Wāqidi...* Considering the content of the units, (c) could have well succeeded (b) in the original arrangement (i.e. al-Wāqidi’s *Kitāb al-ridda*), but, it seems to me that the use of the conjunction *wa-* in *wa-qāla* indicates discontinuity. Unit (d) seems to have originally followed (c), the *qāla* being a structural element in the continuous narrative. All these seemingly petty observations are important for assessing Ibn Ḥubaysh’s accuracy in reproducing his sources, which in turn determines the value of the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* as a source for the reconstruction of lost texts.

3. The most common structure in which quotations from al-Wāqidi appear is a long series of narrative units in which only the first is explicitly ascribed to al-Wāqidi, usually listing the latter’s full chain of authorities. All other units in the series are cited on the authority of their ultimate sources, and the series ends where a new quotation from a book (*wa-fi kitāb*) begins. This structure obfuscates the extent to which Ibn Ḥubaysh drew upon al-Wāqidi; indeed, it could be argued that the closing of the quotations cannot be determined, and that only the first unit in such a series can safely be construed as part of al-Wāqidi’s *Kitāb al-ridda*. There is, for instance, the sequence that consists of four narrative units ascribed to the following authorities: al-Wāqidi (a), al-Kalbī (b), al-Kalbī (c), Ibn Ishaq (d). After (d) is recorded another unit from al-Wāqidi’s book (*wa-fi kitāb al-Wāqidi*). Technically, it seems that accounts (b), (c), and (d) are the continuation of the quotation from al-Wāqidi, but to the best of my knowledge, al-Wāqidi never quotes Ibn Ishaq, the authority cited in

---

(d). Most probably Ibn Ḥubaysh excerpted Ibn Ishāq’s account from al-Ṭabarī, omitting mention of the latter’s name. As for the two passages from al-Kalbî, they could have originated either in al-Wâqidî’s or al-Ṭabarī’s text. Al-Wâqidî, however, is not known to have quoted al-Kalbî often, if at all. It thus appears that in this particular series, only the first account was copied from al-Wâqidî.

Series may be very long indeed, so that the fact (or mere possibility) that they were derived from al-Wâqidî in their entirety may be doubted. For instance, an account on the authority of al-Wâqidî is cited, followed by a series of no less than 29 narrative units and pieces of information. These vary in length from half a line to about 40 lines, and are recorded on the authority of their ultimate sources only (eyewitnesses, etc.). After the 29th account Ibn Ḥubaysh writes: “Al-Wâqidî said: I mentioned [this story] to ‘Abdallâh ibn Ja’far, and he said...” This means that the 29th unit was taken from al-Wâqidî. In addition, units 23-27, recorded on the authority of Maḥmûd ibn Labîd, Ābû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî, ‘Umar b. Muhîmmad, Asmā’ bint Abî Bakr, and Nâfî’, are quoted from al-Wâqidî’s Kitāb al-ridda in yet another source. As for units 1-26, the authorities to whom they are ascribed are mostly persons who are quoted by al-Wâqidî several times, such as Damra b. Sa‘îd, Maḥmûd b. Labîd, among others. Therefore, it seems fairly safe to conclude that the whole series of 30 items was excerpted from al-Wâqidî’s Kitāb al-ridda. Apparently, Ibn Ḥubaysh derived whole series from al-Wâqidî, but mentioned his name only at the beginning in order to avoid repetition.

Not much has hitherto been known about al-Wâqidî’s Kitâb al-ridda because it is not widely quoted. The Bankipore manuscript to which Sezgin refers as al-Wâqidî’s Ridda has proved to be a part of Ibn Aṭham’s Kitāb al-futūḥ. The long passages excerpted by Ibn

---

163 See above.
164 There is an al-Kalbî cited once in al-Wâqidî’s Kitāb al-maghâzi (ed. Jones, II, 864:2), but it cannot be proven that Muḥâmâd ibn al-Sâ’ib is meant.
166 Kitāb takhrîj aḥâdîth al-hidâya (anonymous), fol. 11r-v. This manuscript belonged to a collection of Arab manuscripts in the possession of E. J. Brill, Leiden; see P.S. van Koningsveld and Qasim al-Samarrai, Localities and Dates in Arabic Manuscripts (Catalogue n.° 500), Leiden, 1978, 59-60. Thanks to the kindness of the compilers of this catalogue, I was able to consult some parts of this work.
167 E.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, 28:1, see also 21ult, 27:5 (=ed. I, 71ult, 55, 69ult).
Hubaysh from al-Wāqidi give us a fair idea about the content and methodology of this lost early work.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to several points of similarity between al-Wāqidi and Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī who were both contemporaries and compatriots (Iraq, the second half of the second century AH). As far as the material recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh shows, both authors covered the same events of the ridda wars in various tribes and areas. Although their authorities are different, their accounts are very often similar. There are methodological similarities as well. Like al-Wāqidi, al-Zuhrī recorded accounts which go back to (alleged) eye witnesses and tribal sources. He apparently incorporated lists in his narrative (although there is only one instance recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh), as al-Wāqidi quite frequently did in his *Maghāzī*. Last but not least, al-Zuhrī used collective isnāds, reworking material from several sources into continuous narratives. Ibn Ḥubaysh records what is probably a paraphrase of al-Zuhrī’s own words: “Ya’qūb b. Muhammad b. ‘Isa ibn [...] recorded, on the authority of several of his teachers, some of whom he specified and some of whom he did not, in order to avoid prolixity, reworking their disparate/various accounts into one story in order to make it shorter and more manageable—they said...”. This is reminiscent of al-Wāqidi’s words in his introduction to the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. Originating in the same period and area as al-Wāqidi’s work, al-Zuhrī’s book appears to be of the same genre.

Ibn Ḥubaysh apparently preserved extensive and genuine quotations from early historical works which are otherwise poorly known. Of the three late sources examined in this paper, he is the most suitable for the purpose of reconstructing lost second-century works. The reasons for this are, first, his being the earliest of the three and the source from which the other two drew their material (al-Kalā’ī directly, al-Diyārbakrī indirectly). Second, and more important, are the methods that he employed in his work. Ibn Ḥubaysh made an effort to remain faithful to the original texts. This is indicated by his terminol-
ogy, and by the fact that he did not blend his sources and retained many of the references to his immediate sources. Admittedly, the atomistic structure of the *Kitâb al-ghazawât* results, as in al-Diyârbakrî’s case, not from the piecing together of original disparate units, but from the breaking up of former continuous narratives, mainly those of al-Wâqidî and al-Zuhrî. But as it happens, it is these narratives to which we seek access. It is possible, but useless, to reconstruct part of the *Kitâb al-iktifâ’* from the quotations in the *Ta’rikh al-khamîs.* It is possible and useful to reconstruct parts of the lost works of al-Wâqidî and al-Zuhrî from the *Kitâb al-ghazawât* by Ibn Ḥubaysh.

It has been shown that quotations are not always taken directly from the cited works, and that quoted material could be reworked so as to lose its original form, and yet retain the ascription to the original authority. Thus texts that have been transformed may have the appearance of straightforward quotations. For the purpose of reconstruction, it is therefore necessary to look not only for genuine first-hand quotations, but also for indications that the quoting author made an effort to reproduce the original texts accurately. The text, as well as the terminology of transmission, should be analysed, and the introductory statements of the author should be taken into account, in order to assess the value of a given work as a source for reconstruction. Above all, it should be borne in mind that an indiscriminate collection of quotations is not likely to result in the recovery of a genuine lost work.

Appendix A
Collation of al-Diyârbakrî and al-Kalâ‘î (page:line)

The purpose of this collation is to show how al-Diyârbakrî used al-Kalâ‘î’s text as a basis into which he inserted other pieces of information. I therefore did not indicate every omission, paraphrase and abridgement made by al-Diyârbakrî (these are not numerous anyway), but rather have focused on his additions.

Appendix B

Collation of References in al-Kalâ’i and Ibn Ḥubaysh
(The numbers in parentheses refer to Ghunaym’ edition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Kalâ’i</th>
<th>Ibn Ḥubaysh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ibn Ishaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>al-Zuhri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>al-Wâqidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:22 (I, 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6 (I, 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

175 The material in al-Kalâ’i 55-63 was copied by al-Diyārbakrī in another place, 155-9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>Abū Hurayra</td>
<td>11:18 (I, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>Abū Marzūq</td>
<td>11:19 (I, 28), Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb ‘an Abū Marzūq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:4</td>
<td>Ibn Ishāq (abridged)</td>
<td>14:19 (I,36) Ibn Ishāq in his <em>Maghāzī</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:4</td>
<td>Sabra al-Juhanī</td>
<td>15:24 (I,39) apparently from al-Wâqidī’s <em>Ridda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:1</td>
<td>Ḥanḍala b. ‘Alī</td>
<td>16:13 (I,41) al-Wâqidî, with an isnād to Ḥanḍala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:5</td>
<td>Nāfī’ b. Jubayr</td>
<td>16:17 (I, 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:6</td>
<td>‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr</td>
<td>17:22 (I, 44) al-Wâqidî in his isnād quoting ‘Urwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:6</td>
<td>al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>21:29 (I, 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:1</td>
<td>al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>23:6 (I, 58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:8</td>
<td>al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>23:26 (I, 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>Yazīd b. Sharīk</td>
<td>27:11 (I, 70) apparently quoted from al-Wâqidî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54:8</td>
<td>Ya’qūb al-Zuhri, al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>29:20 (I, 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56:1</td>
<td>Râfî’ b. Khudayj</td>
<td>30:10 (I, 78) al-Wâqidî in his isnād from Râfî’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56:5</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Abbās</td>
<td>30:12 (I, 78) apparently quoted from al-Wâqidî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58:6</td>
<td>Ibn Ishāq</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59:2</td>
<td>Râfî’ b. Khudayj</td>
<td>31:2 (I, 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64:6</td>
<td>Sharīk al-Fazārī</td>
<td>35:20 (I, 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71:2</td>
<td>al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>36:10 (I, 94) al-Wâqidî from Hishām b. Sa’d from al-Rujayl b. Iyās....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75:3</td>
<td>al-Umawī</td>
<td>38:20 (I, 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78:11</td>
<td>‘Ikrima</td>
<td>40:1 (I, 103) apparently from al-Wâqidî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78:15</td>
<td>al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>42:10 (I, 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80:4</td>
<td>Waḥšî</td>
<td>40:7 (I, 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81:1</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Umar</td>
<td>40:15 (I, 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81:4</td>
<td>Sharīk al-Fazārī</td>
<td>40:17 (I, 105) Yazīd b. Sharīk from his father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83:1</td>
<td>Damra b. Sa‘îd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86:7</td>
<td>Abû Khaythama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88:1</td>
<td>Wâqîd b. ‘Amr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88:15</td>
<td>Wâqîd b. ‘Amr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89:1</td>
<td>Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:8</td>
<td>Khalîd b. al-Walîd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93:12</td>
<td>Damra b. Sa‘îd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94:7</td>
<td>al-Hârith b. Fudayl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95:1</td>
<td>Wâshī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98:13</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Yahyâ b. Hibân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101:1</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Umar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103:3</td>
<td>Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104:1</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Labîd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109:14</td>
<td>Wathîma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114:5</td>
<td>Zayd b. Aslam - his father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115:14</td>
<td>al-Wâqîdî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116:9</td>
<td>Zayd b. Aslam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118:6</td>
<td>Ya’qûb al-Zuhî (abridged)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120:12</td>
<td>Sâlim b. ‘Abdallâh b. ‘Umar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121:1</td>
<td>Zayd b. Talha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121:3</td>
<td>Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122:2</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Umar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123:8</td>
<td>al-Wâqîdî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124:7</td>
<td>Ya’qûb al-Zuhî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125:1</td>
<td>al-Wâqîdî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130:11</td>
<td>Sufyân b. Abî al-‘Awjâ’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134:1</td>
<td>Hishâm b. ‘Urwa – his father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136:1</td>
<td>al-Hasan b. Abî al-Hasan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140:11</td>
<td>Ishâq b. Yahyâ b. Talha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix C

Analysis of One Reshaped Account

In the following table I trace al-Kalâ’î’s text line by line, showing how it was composed from selected pieces of Ibn Ḥubaysh’s text. The original sequence in Ibn Ḥubaysh is A1, A2, B2a, B2b. For the contents of these accounts see above, 65-68. I indicate the references to the sources as recorded in each of the two texts. The references in parentheses are to Ghunaym’s edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Kalâ’î</th>
<th>Ibn Ḥubaysh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:6-4:3 (no source mentioned)</td>
<td>10:8-13 (I, 25) al-Wâqidî, (B2b); it is a continuation of (B2a) and al-Wâqidî’s name is not repeated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3-5 al-Wâqidî</td>
<td>10:6-8 (I, 24) al-Wâqidî (B2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12-15 no source mentioned</td>
<td>10:3-6 (I, 24) al-Wâqidî (B1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>9:29 (I, 24) part of (A2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some recent works relevant to the subject


ABSTRACT

Many sources have not come down to us, therefore scholars make attempts to reconstruct them from quotations in later works. This paper argues that the reconstruction of lost sources does not consist in mere collection of quotations. By a close examination of three late sources, the paper shows that quotations may be second hand or third hand, while having the appearance of direct citations. It also shows how quoted material can be quite transformed from the original. The conclusion is that when attempting reconstruction, the sources from which the quotations are taken should be carefully examined for their intent, methodology, and terminology of transmission.

RESUMEN

Ante el hecho evidente de que muchas fuentes no se nos han conservado, diversos estudiosos intentan reconstruirlas a base de citas conservadas en obras posteriores. Este artículo mantiene que la reconstrucción de fuentes perdidas no puede hacerse únicamente a base de juntar las citas y lo demuestra por medio del cotejo de tres fuentes tardías en las que se ve que las citas pueden provenir de segunda o tercera mano, aunque tengan la apariencia de citas directas. También se muestra que el material citado puede haber sido profundamente transformado. Se concluye, pues, que cuando se intenta una reconstrucción, es necesario examinar cuidadosamente las fuentes para establecer sus objetivos, metodología y terminología de transmisión.