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In 1847 Pascual de Gayangos purchased in Morocco an Arabic manuscript which he identified as Futūh al-Shām (The Conquest of Syria) by Wāqidī. Gayangos was misled by the header preceding the introduction to the work, which reads: «The master, scholar and spiritual leader, the learned Abū ‘Abdallāh Sīdī Muhammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī, said...». By the time the collection of Gayangos was catalogued, two facts have emerged. First, the text known as Futūh al-Shām is not a genuine work by Wāqidī. Secondly, the manuscript in question is not a copy of pseudo Wāqidī’s Futūh al-Shām, but a work entitled Al-durr al-nafis fi uns al-zā’īn wa-l-jalīs (The Precious Pearl, Joy of the Traveler and the Stay-at-Home). This is explicitly stated by the anonymous compiler in the introduction to the work. The header that seems to attribute the whole work, or at least the introduction, to Wāqidī, was evidently added by a hand later than the compiler’s.

Behind the florid name lies a wholly unoriginal work. The anonymous compiler states in his introduction that he stitched together parts of two texts, namely, the Futūh al-Shām by Wāqidī (which we now know to be a false ascription) and another, similar work by Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalāmankī. The manuscript contains 159 folios, the number of lines ranging between 25-28 per page, in a beautiful Magribī script. In such a long text I expected to find a clue to the compiler’s identity, such as an occasional qāla followed by the compiler’s name (like qāla Abī Ja’far in the History of Tabārī). I therefore carefully read the whole work, but to no avail. There is no clue as to the time, place or identity of the compiler. According to the colophon the book was «accomplished» (najiza) by Muhammad b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām b. ‘Ummān (? perhaps ‘Ashshūr) al-Ḥasanī al-Wazzānī al-Tīwānī al-Darqāwī. The idiom najiza ‘alā yaday, «was accomplished by», often occurs in colophons, referring to the copyists rather than the compilers. I could find no details about this Muhammad

* I thank my colleague Maribel Fierro who kindly gave me the Gayangos manuscript, and was helpful whenever help was needed.
1 See Teres Sádaba, Manuscritos, p. 27 (n.° XVIII).
2 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 1b.
3 I thank Jan Just Witkam, of the Leiden University Library, for confirming my impression in this matter on the basis of his rich experience.
b. Muhammad, but the nisba Darqawi gives a clue. It indicates Muhammad’s affiliation with the Sufi order Darqawi, which was founded in northern Morocco in the late 18th century. This means that Muhammad b. Muhammad lived at that period or later, and that our manuscript was «accomplished» no earlier than the late 18th century. The fact that Muhammad b. Muhammad is both late and not widely known seems to corroborate the impression that «accomplished» means «copied», not «compiled», in other words, that Muhammad b. Muhammad was the copyist and not the author of Al-durr al-naﬁs.

A fragment of Al-durr is kept at the library of the Escuela de Estudios Árabes in Granada. It is written in a much less pretty, yet legible Maghribi script. It is preceded by a page containing a piece of «useful information» (furniture) about the special magical qualities of certain Qur’anic verses. This information, however, is not useful for supplying any clue as to the identity of the compiler or the provenance of the manuscript. Random samples (including the two isnads, for which see below) indicate the close affinity of the texts contained in the two manuscripts of Al-durr al-naﬁs. A salient illustration of this fact is the mistaken variant, minhaj «custom», which occurs in both manuscripts instead of the correct version, alladhi kana haja «That which urged (Abu Bakr to act)». There is no colophon in the Granada manuscript, and there is nothing that I can at present add about it. Henceforth all the references in this article are to the Gayangos manuscript except when otherwise indicated.

As noted above, the text of Al-durr al-naﬁs is made up of fragments of two works, one attributed to Wāqidi (d. 204/819), the other to Abu ‘Umar al-Talamanki (d. 429/1037). At one point in the manuscript the following statement is recorded: «The authors of the sira, who also transmitted from reliable sources accounts of the conquests of Syria, and whom I mentioned, together with their sources (isnads), at the beginning of this volume —among them were Muhammad b. Ishaq, Sayf b. ‘Umar, and Abu ‘Abdallah Muhammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidi— each told me what he had heard, a reliable source transmitting from a reliable source; they all said...». This statement emulates the clichés used by historians to introduce composite accounts,

---

4 I thank my colleague Frank Stewart for pointing out this fact to me. See EF, II, 160, s.v. Darqawi (R. Le Tourneau). The works by O. Depont, X. Coppolani and G. Drague, cited by Le Tourneau, list many Darqawi shuyukh, but I could not identify Muhammad b. Muhammad among them.

5 I thank Luis Molina for kindly sending me a cd-rom copy. Since the pages are unnumbered, I had to number them myself, which I did consecutively (not by folios). There are only three citations from the Granada manuscript in this article.

6 The structure of the sentence leaves no doubt as to the correct version. Al-durr al-naﬁs fol. 12b 1. 8, Granada ms. 38; the correct form is found in Azdî, Futuh al-Sham, 53. The mistake probably originated in a variant that read mimnū hāja (instead of alladhi haja).
assembled from various sources and processed into new texts. It is not known who the
speaker is in this case, but the statement is by no means correct. Muḥammad b. Ishaq
and Sayf b. ‘Umar were not mentioned «at the beginning of the volume» nor anywhere
else in Al-durr al-nafis. Throughout the work only two texts are cited, precisely as
stated in the introduction, namely, the works by (pseudo) Wāqidī and Ṭālamānḵī.

Both these works are problematic. If I had hoped that Al-durr al-nafis
contained a genuine Futūḥ al-Shām by Wāqidī, this hope soon faded away, for a
collation of random passages from Al-durr al-nafis with the known pseudo Wāqidī
Futūḥ al-Shām proves them to be versions of the same text. Pseudo Wāqidī’s is a
popular text, of which many versions exist. Although it is still published under
Wāqidī’s name,7 the work has long been known as a fraud of the Crusaders’ time.8
The question of Wāqidī’s Futūḥ al-Shām seems thus settled, but the actual author
has not been identified. The author of the second work, Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭālamānḵī,
was a well known Andalusian scholar who specialized in ḥadīth, Qur’ān and
theology. However, no biographical source attributes to him any work on futūḥ, or
on any other historical issue. Among the many works which he transmitted, only
two relate to history (but not to the conquests), namely, the Sīra by Ibn Hishām and
the Tabaqāt by Abū al-‘Arab al-Tamīmī.9 In the present anonymous manuscript,
that is, Al-durr al-nafis, the work attributed to Ṭālamānḵī is never mentioned by
name, but is constantly referred to as «his compilation» (muṣannafihī). We thus
have a Futūḥ al-Shām, pseudo Wāqidī’s, lacking an author, and an author,
Ṭālamānḵī, lacking a Futūḥ al-Shām.

As far as I can see, the present manuscript of Al-durr al-nafis can add nothing
to our knowledge as regards the identity of pseudo Wāqidī. In this article my
concern is with the texts which the anonymous compiler of Al-durr quoted from
Ṭālamānḵī’s «compilation».

THE ISNĀDS

The compiler of Al-durr al-nafis mentions twice the source of Ṭālamānḵī’s
material. On the first page of the manuscript we find the following isnād:

8 See Sivan, L’Islam, 197-99; Conrad, «Al-Azdî’s history», 33 and the literature cited there.
9 See Fierro, «El proceso».
→
→
Abū al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
→
→
al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
→
Abū Ismā‘īl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh.

On fol. 12b there is another version of the chain, which runs as follows:
Abū ‘Umar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Muqri’
→
Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Yahyā b. Mufarrij
→
Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ḥasan b. Ishāq al-Baghdādī al-Jawhari
→
al-Walīd b. Ǧāmid al-Rumaylī
→
al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
→
Abū Ismā‘īl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh - his father.¹⁰

These are obviously two garbled versions of the same chain of transmitters. Ṭalamanḵī’s immediate source (the second link in the isnāds) is recorded in both versions as Muḥammad b. Yahyā, with a variation further up the genealogy (b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī al-Zanādim on fol. 1b, and b. Mufarrij on 12b). Among Ṭalamanḵī’s numerous masters there is no one by this name. There is, however, one Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yahyā b. Mufarrij, an important Andalusian qādī and transmitter, who died in 380/990. It is very probable that Ṭalamanḵī’s immediate source, recorded in Al-duṛr al-nafsī as «Muḥammad b. Yahyā», was this Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yahyā b. Mufarrij. This is borne out not merely by the similarity of the names, but also by the fact that Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yahyā was the only one among Ṭalamanḵī’s masters who had anything to do with the study of history.¹¹

¹⁰ The Granada ms. is identical, the isnāds are recorded on 3 and 37 respectively.
I could find nothing on the 3rd link recorded on fol. 1b, Abū al-Hasan b. Ziyād. This name may be a «filling» emulating the penultimate link, al-Ḥasan (read: al-Ḥusayn) b. Ziyād.

The names of the next Hnks (three on fol. 1b, four on fol. 12b) are garbled, but they can be retrieved from other sources. The correct forms of the names are:

Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alî b. Aḥmad b. İshāq al-Baghdādî
↓
al-Walîd b. Ḥammâd al-Ramlî
↓
al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād al-Ramlî
↓
Abū İsmâ‘îl Muḥammad b. ʻAbdallâh al-Azdî al-Baṣrî

This is the chain that transmitted the controversial text entitled Futūḥ al-Shām, yet another work on the conquests of Syria, which should not be confused with the Futūḥ al-Shām by pseudo Wâqidî. The text transmitted by this chain is attributed to the oldest link recorded here, Abū İsmâ‘îl al-Azdî. Azdî is paradoxically both well-known and unknown. He is well-known as the author of the work just mentioned, the Futūḥ al-Shām, but nothing whatsoever is known about him personally.12 This fact, among others, caused scholars of the 19th century to doubt that Azdî ever existed, and to conclude that the work attributed to him is a fraud of the Crusaders’ time, analogous to the Futūḥ al-Shām by pseudo Wâqidî.13 I shall come back to this issue at the end of this article, showing that this conclusion of the 19th century scholars is mistaken.

Azdî’s Futūḥ al-Shām was transmitted by the very chain recorded here not only to ʻAlamânkî, but also (with additional, later links) to the Andalusian Ibn Khayr al-Ishbîlî (d. 575/1179),14 and to the Egyptian Abū ʻṬâhir al-Silaflî (d. 576/1180). Al-Silaflî’s version exists in manuscripts of the 13th century; it was twice edited and published.15 The isnâd remained alive and continued to grow

12 The identification by ʻĀmir, who published the work in 1970, is wrong, see ʻUmarî, Dirāsât, 71-2, and below.
13 See Conrad, «Al-Azdî’s history», 29.
14 Ibn Khayr, Fâṭrasa, I, 238 (also cited by Conrad, «Al-Azdî’s history», 57).
15 See the full chain down to al-Silaflî in both printed editions of Azdî’s Futūḥ al-Shām (see the bibliography at the end of this article). Three manuscripts are mentioned by Sivan, L’Islam, 199, two of them in Berlin and one in Paris. See also GAS, I, 292-293; Kahâlî, Mu‘jam al-mu‘allîfîn, III, 429 (the material cited there refers to Nassau’s edition and is not very helpful). Ahlwardt mistook the Berlin mss.
from al-Silafí onwards, with two additional links connecting al-Silafí with Ibn al-
‘Adîm (d. 660/1262). The latter included in his Bughyat al-talab fi ta’rikh Ḥalab five passages from Azdí’s Futūḥ al-Shām, with the full isnād.\textsuperscript{16}

The first three links transmitting from Azdí, namely, ‘Alî b. ʿÂḥmad, al-Walîd b. Ḥammâd and al-Husayn b. Ziyâd, are thus common to the Andalusian (both Ṭalamanaki and Ibn Khayr), Egyptian and Egypto-Syrian isnāds which narrated Azdí’s Futūḥ al-Shām. However, these three individuals are not very well known. ‘Alî b. ʿÂḥmad was a traditionist who died in Egypt after 340/951-2.\textsuperscript{17} His biography contains no indication that he had anything to do with the study of historical material in general or the Futūḥ al-Shām in particular. Nevertheless, among those who transmitted traditions from ‘Alî b. ʿÂḥmad, Dhaḥabî lists one Munîr b. ʿÂḥmad. Dhaḥabî supplies no details, but it turns out that this Munîr is the same person who transmitted Azdí’s Futūḥ al-Shām from ‘Alî b. ʿÂḥmad to the Egyptian (and Egypto-Syrian) transmitters, culminating in al-Silafí and Ibn al-‘Adîm.\textsuperscript{18} The genuineness of this part of the Egyptian isnād is thus unwittingly corroborated by Dhaḥabî.

Al-Walîd b. Ḥammâd was a traditionist of the town of Ramla, who is well-known for his compilation on the merits of Jerusalem (Faḍā’il Bayt al-Maqdis). He died around the year 300/912-3. There is no indication in his biography that he studied or transmitted material on the conquests of Syria.\textsuperscript{19}

Al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyâd is virtually unknown. There is a person by this name who is described as «negligible, unknown» (martük majhûl). No details are given, except that he transmitted material from Muqāṭîl b. Sulaymān.\textsuperscript{20} Since Muqāṭîl died in 150/767-8, this al-Ḥusayn seems too early to have been the informant of al-Walîd b. Ḥammâd (who died around 300/912-3). Ibn ‘Asākir mentions one al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyâd al-Simsâr al-Ramlî who transmitted from one ʿĀḥmad b. al-Muʿammil al-Dimashqî; no further details are given.\textsuperscript{21} The name

\begin{itemize}
\item of Azdí’s work for the (pseudo) Wâqîjî’s Futūḥ al-Shām (Ahlwardt 9767 and 9768). The Paris ms. (n.° 1664) was edited by W. N. Lees (in 1854). The second editor, ‘Abd al-Mun‘îm ʿÀmir (in 1970), claims that he used a manuscript from a private collection, but this is dubious, see Conrad, note 18. Notwithstanding, the variations between Lees, 90-1 and ʿÀmir, 100-103 suggest that ʿÀmir did have additional material (although not necessarily a manuscript of Futūḥ al-Shām).
\item Ibn al-ʿAdîm, Bughyat al-talab, I, 69-70, 569, 572; III, 1336; VII, 3150.
\item Dhaḥabî, Siyar, XV, 474-5. The editor remarks that he found nowhere else a biography of ‘Alî b. ʿÂḥmad b. Iṣḥâq. My own efforts in this matter were unsuccessful as well.
\item See notes 15 and 16 above. On Munîr b. ʿÂḥmad see Dhaḥabî, Siyar, XVII, 267, XVIII, 496; Ḥabbâl, Šafayāt, I, 56.
\item Dhaḥabî, Siyar, XIV, 78-9. See also Conrad, 57.
\item See Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, II, 348; Dhaḥabî, Mizān, I, 535 («Al-Azdî» mentioned in these two sources is not Abû ʿIsâm‘îl, author of Futūḥ al-Shām, but Abû al-Faṭḥ al-Azdî).
\item Ibn ‘Asâkir, Ta’rikh Dimashq, VI, 40.
\end{itemize}
al-Husayn b. Ziyâd occurs in the isnâds of several hadiths, but my investigation of these invariably led to a dead end.


The isnâds recorded in the anonymous Al-durr al-nafis, although garbled, indicate that Tālāmānki’s compilation, incorporated in Al-durr, contained material from Futüh al-Shâm by Azdî. Moreover, the compiler of Al-durr al-nafis very often refers the quotations from Tālāmānki back to Abû Ismâ’il, namely, al-Azdî. We may now turn to the text to check this conclusion further.

THE TEXT

The compiler of Al-durr al-nafis quoted about 65 passages from Tālāmānki’s compilation. These passages range in length from one line to several pages. In the latter case the quotations are often composed of several narrative units. A collation of these passages with Futüh al-Shâm by Azdî shows that both Tālāmānki and the anonymous compiler who cited him tended to preserve Azdî’s narrative units intact.\(^{23}\) Nevertheless, sometimes the anonymous compiler breaks off in the middle of a narrative, taken from one of his two sources (Azdî and pseudo Wâqidî), in order to continue it with material from his other source. These breaks are nearly always explicitly indicated by qala followed by the name of the source introduced afresh.\(^{24}\) Occasionally, qala, unfollowed by any name, is introduced in the middle of the narrative. This usually indicates a seam where the compiler omitted a passage from the quoted narrative unit, or else joined together two disparate passages from the same source. Generally speaking, there are no conflicting reports on one and the same event. The structure of Al-durr al-nafis is that of a continuous narrative based on two alternating sources.

The quotations from Tālāmānki are consistently introduced by a variant of the phrase «Abû ‘Umar said in his compilation, on the authority of...». One or both of the last two elements, namely, «in his compilation» and «on the authority

\(^{22}\) Conrad, «Al-Azdî’s history», 57-8 seems to be confusing them when he cites evidence that al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyâd was a Shi‘î. The Shi‘î one was al-Ḥasan b. Ziyâd al-Lu’lu’î, see Ibn al-‘Adîm, Buğhya, I, 291. See also Ibn Ḥajar, Lisân, VI, 269; Qurashî, Jawâhir, III, 579.

\(^{23}\) E.g. fol. 80b l. 8, cf. Azdî 152 l. 11; 88a l. 12, cf. Azdî 199 l. 5; 100b l. 20, cf. Azdî, 226 l. 7; fol. 148b l. 3, cf. Azdî 242 l. 12. See also 80b l. 19 where the compiler picks up Azdî’s narrative in the middle, Azdî 152 l. 13.
of» are sometimes missing. The names following the term «on the authority of» are either Muhammad b. 'Abdallah Abu Ismâ‘îl al-Azdî al-Basrî (usually in a shortened form), or the sources used by Azdî, or a combination of the two. When ŢalamanÎî says «I was told by», one should not be misled: except in the two cases discussed above (namely, fols. 1b and 12b), ŢalamanÎî was not told anything by anyone; he merely copied Azdî’s isnâds. A phrase such as «Abû al-Zinâ‘î told me» is Azdî’s; copied by ŢalamanÎî, it makes the wrong impression. Of course such occurrences may have arisen not from ŢalamanÎî’s methodology, but from the cut and paste procedures of the anonymous compiler.

Collating all these passages quoted from ŢalamanÎî with the published (Silafî’s) version of Azdî’s Futûh al-Shàm was a laborious, lengthy task. It may be summarized in one sentence: except for two cases, every quotation from ŢalamanÎî in Al-durr al-nafls is found in Azdî’s text. A third passage, seemingly quoted from ŢalamanÎî and lacking in Azdî, turned out to be a quotation from pseudo-Wâqîdî. This means that ŢalamanÎî’s «compilation» is merely a transmission of Azdî’s Futûh al-Shàm. Had ŢalamanÎî composed a genuine work on Futûh al-Shàm, we would expect at least some of the numerous quotations from him to be derived from works other than Azdî’s. This conclusion would explain why ŢalamanÎî’s biographers never credit him with a work on Futûh, and why his «compilation» remains nameless throughout Al-durr al-nafls. Apparently the anonymous compiler of Al-durr mistook a copy of Azdî’s Futûh al-Shàm, transmitted by ŢalamanÎî, for a genuine work by the latter.

ŢalamanÎî’s version of Azdî’s Futûh al-Shàm is plainly different from Silafî’s as published by Lees and ‘Àmir. A systematic examination of the textual variations shows that almost without exception, the two published texts are alike, and ŢalamanÎî’s version different. The variations, however, although countless, are typically minor. They are of various kinds. The order of the words or the arrangement of the sentence is sometimes different, such as: kitâbunà wa-nabiyyunà in one version, nabiyyunà wa-kitâbunà in the other; wa-kâna bi-l-yamàma wajjahahu ila Musaylima vs. wa-huwa bi-1-yamâma wa-kàna wajjahahu ila Musaylima... Alternative synonymous words, or different

25 Al-durr al-nafls fol. 14a l. 23. On the phenomenon of secondary quotations see Landau-Tasseron, «On the reconstruction of lost sources».
26 The exceptions are a) Al-durr al-nafls fol. 54b l. 25-55a l. 14. The last four lines, however, are woven into Azdî’s text in another place, 102 ll. 15-18, and 103 ll. 13-14, and b) the final passage of Al-durr al-nafls. For the list of the collated passages see appendix.
28 Rare exceptions are: ŢalamanÎî 114a lines 14-19 = Lees 231, whereas in ‘Àmir 255 a few words are omitted; ŢalamanÎî 116a l. 22 (lam aima’) = Lees, 239 l. 8, whereas ‘Àmir 266 lìne 2 has lam ara.
29 Al-durr al-nafls, fol. 63a l. 14 vs. Azdî, 120 l. 11; fol. 12b l. 22 vs. Azdî, 54, l. 9-10.
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expressions conveying the same meaning, occur frequently, such as aswāt in one version, nidā’ in the other; fa-amiddanā vs. fa-asri’ ilaynā; qāla wāḥid min al-muslimin vs. qāla rājiz; ya’izu al-nās vs. yaqussu ’alā al-nās; là yastaṭf ‘u vs. là yuṭbuat. Omissions and additions, both intentional and otherwise, are there as well. Omissions of whole passages in Ṭalamanḵī may be due to the editorial work of the anonymous compiler of Al-durr. Rarely, Ṭalamanḵī’s text says something different from, or even contradictory to Silafí’s version: min qibali maysaratihim vs. ’alā maymanatihim; là afalu vs. afalu; ammara ‘alayhā wa-ṣalaṭa ahlāhā, vs. anmana ahlāhā wa-ṣalaṭuḥu; fa-kāna dhalika min ta’jil al-suḥûf vs. fa-kāna dhalika mimmā Yamna’uhi min tu’jil al-suḥûf; fa-addrū al-jizya ‘an yadin wa-antum šāhirīn vs. fa-addrū al-jizya ilaynā fī kull ’am wa-antum šāhirīn; wa-lā yughayyirūna wa-lā yanqudūna vs. fa-l-yanqudūna wa-l-yanqudūna. Some, but not all, of these variations may be mistakes or careless omissions. It also happens that, due to the cut and paste method used by the anonymous compiler, the sequence of events in Al-durr al-nafis is different from Silafí’s version of Azdī. Names of people and places are often garbled in Ṭalamanḵī’s version. Some are undoubtedly copyist errors, such as Ayla instead of al-Ubulla, or Antāj/Intāj instead of Nibáj. Others seem to indicate different narrations. Sometimes Ṭalamanḵī’s version reveals a specific Andalusian orientation. The constant

30 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 66a line 3, vs. Azdī, 136 line 5; fol. 13a, 1. 25, vs. 58, 1. 3; fol. 15b l. 10 vs. 75 l. 13; fol. 65a l. 19 vs. 131 l. 2; 96a l. 17 vs. 215 l. 4.
31 Compare, for example: Al-durr, fol. 7b lines 17-19 with Azdī, 51 lines 5-6, 10, and Azdī-Lees, 44 l. 1; fols. 84b l. 7, where a passage occurring in Azdī, 166 l. 4-9 is missing. Omissions sometimes do not affect the text, at other times they change its meaning, see e.g. Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 61a l. 2 vs. Azdī 107 l. 5.
32 E.g. Azdī, 56 2nd paragraph (its place in Ṭalamanḵī is 13b line 12); Azdī 62 l. 2-63 l. 10 (its place in Ṭalamanḵī: 13b penult.). For another salient example, see Al-durr al-nafis 14b ll. 22-26 as compared to Azdī, 69 ult. 71 l. 1.
33 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 66a line 5 vs. Azdī, 136 line 7; fol. 116a l. 25 vs. Azdī, 266, l. 10; fol. 14a l. 1, vs. Azdī, 63 l. 11; fol. 44b l. 18 vs. Azdī, 98 l. 3; fol. 62b l. 25 vs. Azdī, 118 l. 17; 108b l. 7 vs. 234 l. 17. See also fol. 55a vs. Azdī, 102-3, where the versions are quite different; fol. 44b vs. Azdī, 96, where the description of the battle is different; fol. 66a l. 11 ff. vs. Azdī, 137 l. 1 ff., where the content of Mu‘ādh’s address is different (there is also a passage missing in Azdī here, occurring in Al-durr al-nafis 66a ll. 15-25); fol. 28a ult. vs. Azdī, 85 l. 9-12, where Ṭalamanḵī’s version seems like a summary of Azdī.
34 See e.g. ‘Umar’s procedures in Al-durr al-nafis, fols. 113a-115b compared to Azdī, 253-7.
35 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 13a l. 19, 22, and 13b l. 1-Azdī, 57 ll. 8, 13, and 58 l. 4; Al-durr al-nafis, 13b, ll. 5, 18-Azdī, 59 l. 1, and 61 l. 5. See also Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 14b l. 23, ‘Ṣandawādâ’, read by ‘Amr as ‘Mandawâd’, Azdī, 70 note 1. Ibn Hubaysh has ‘Ṣaydâdâ’, which the editor read as ‘Ṣandâdâ’, Ibn Hubaysh, Al-ghazawât wa-l-fiitïih, l. 183.
36 The commander of the cavalry is Zayd b. ‘Amr b. Nufayl in Silafí’s version, Azdī, 96 l. 4 (but see also l. 6). Sa‘id b. Zayd in Ṭalamanḵī, Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 44b l. 2. The name Banû Sahm
threat in al-Andalus were the Christian powers, the counterparts of the Byzantines of early Islam. This, I think, is the origin of the following variations: Nahr al-Damm, «the river of blood», became in Talamanki’s version Nahr al-Rüm, «the river of the Byzantines». Jâban, who is described in Silafi’s version as «one of the nobles of the ‘Ajam» (usually meaning Persians), became Jâfan, «one of the nobles of the Byzantines» in Talamanki’s version. «Tell him to withstand the people» (muwâqafat al-qawm) in Silafi’s version, is «tell him to fight the Byzantines» (muwâqa’at al-rüm) in Talamanki’s version. However, there is also an inverse example, where Silafi’s version uses the term rüm whereas Talamanki’s employs a different term. Certain omissions may be due to Andalusian orientation as well. A rather important passage, referring to internal divisions of the Arabs in Syria, is omitted in Talamanki’s version, perhaps because it made no sense to Andalusians. Again, it is perhaps the anonymous compiler of Al-durr al-nafis who is responsible for this omission.

**THE MAKING OF TEXTS**

The collation of the various versions of Futuh al-Shàm affords some general insights into the making of texts.

A remarkable phenomenon occurs twice in the Talamanki’s text as rendered in Al-durr al-nafis: a gloss, or an explanation, that was written on the margin of Silafi’s version is incorporated into the text of Al-durr. As a rule, such an occurrence would indicate that Silafi preserved a version older than Talamanki’s, at least in this case. But there is no way of knowing whether it was Talamanki himself, or the compiler of Al-durr al-nafis, or even a later copyist, who incorporated the explanatory sentences into the narrative. At any of the Quraysh, in Azdî 138 penult., is rendered Tamîm in Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 66b l. 13 (Sahm and Tamîm can be confused on orthographical grounds). Of course Silafi’s version may be garbled as well, especially in ‘Amir’s edition, see ‘Umarî, Dirâsât, 78-9.

33 Azdî, 63 ll. 12-13 cf. Ta’rikh, III, 345 l. 18; Al-durr, fol. 14a l. 2.

34 Azdî, 63 l. 12; Al-durr, 14a l. 1. ‘Ajam in Silafi’s version must be «Persians» since the account is about the conquest of Ulayyis, near al-Anbàr.

35 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 61a l. 13 vs. Azdî, 108 l. 10, muwâqafa and muwâqa’a are of course very similar orthographically. Perhaps the variation ‘ilj (Azdî, 178 l. 14) vs. al-bitnq (Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 94a l. 20), belongs to the same category.

36 Arf al-Rüm vs. arf al-urdunn, Azdî, 140 penult. vs. Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 67a l. 7.

37 The passage is in Azdî, 168 l. 13-169 l. 14.

38 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 14b ll. 11-14 and 47a l. 12 vs. Azdî, 68 last three lines, and 98 ll. 14-5.
rate, this phenomenon gives us a glimpse into the making of texts: a later addition becomes an indistinguishable part of the original text.

Another such glimpse is provided by what may be called wandering passages, or building blocks. The collation of the texts reveals that certain sentences, or passages, are variously incorporated into texts. For example, in the story of Abū ‘Ubayda’s dismissal, there is a description of the messenger who brought the news, and the reaction of Abū ‘Ubayda and the Muslims upon receiving it. In Talamankî’s version the story ends with the text of Abū Bakr’s letter of dismissal. Silâfi’s version omits the text of the letter and goes on with the narrative. The omitted text occurs later in Silâfi’s version within a different context. In another instance, sentences and expressions that form part of Abū Bakr’s letter to the people of Yemen occur in another account as part of Abū Bakr’s speech to the tribesmen gathered near Medina. Yet another case is a passage that forms part of ‘Umar’s letter to Abū ‘Ubayda and Mu‘âdh in Silâfi’s version. The same passage occurs in Talamankî’s narration as part of Abū ‘Ubayda’s address to Khâlid b. al-Walîd. These textual events are different from the familiar phenomena of the topos and the theme. The latter two are a sort of forms into which actual contents are poured or adapted, but wandering passages are the very actual contents transferred between narratives, pieces of texts which transmitters handled with surprising freedom. My impression is that such freedom is more characteristic of early texts than of later ones, just as transmission of ḥadîth by content (bi-l-maʿnâ) rather than verbatim was an early phenomenon that disappeared in later times. At any rate, it seems that letters and addresses are specially prone to wandering between narratives, but the phenomenon occurs on other occasions as well. Of course this is related to the technique of cut and paste used by compilers.

The technique of cut and paste is carried by the anonymous compiler of Al-durr al-naﬁs almost to the extreme. In the middle of a narrative from one source

---

43 Al-durr al-naﬁs, fol. 16b II. 10-24, vs. Azdî, 72 II. 10-7, and 86 II. 5-8.


46 Cf. also the anecdote in Al-durr al-naﬁs, fol. 15a II. 16-9, differently told in Tabarî, Taʾrikh, III, 416-7.
he sometimes inserts even one sentence from the other. Since he mentions the source even of such an isolated sentence, the seam is obvious. We can imagine how a new version, in fact a new text is created, when the compiler decides to omit the indication of the source. The new text is also augmented by connectives, or explanatory sentences. Working by the cut and paste method, compilers must sometimes add explanatory sentences that were not necessary in the original text. Thus Tālamānḵī (or the compiler of Al-durr al-nafis) omits the text of a letter by Abū ‘Ubayda, but adds a sentence to explain the gist of that letter (Abū ‘Ubayda’s fear of the Byzantines), which in turn leads to the next stage of the story (appointment of Khālid b. al-Walīd over Abū ‘Ubayda). In another place Tālamānḵī summarizes a significant part of a letter attributed to ‘Umar, rephrasing the content in two lines.

On the basis of both the isnāds and the actual text there is not a shade of doubt that Tālamānḵī’s «compilation», quoted in Al-durr al-nafis, is a version of Azdī’s Futūḥ al-Shām. The controversy regarding this text is the theme of the next section of this article.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF AZDĪ’S FUTŪḤ AL-SHĀM

No hard facts are available regarding Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdī and the provenance of the Futūḥ al-Shām attributed to him. A version of the work, transmitted by the 13th century Egyptian scholar Abū Ṭāhir al-Silāfī, was found in the middle of the 19th century and edited by William Nassau Lees (in 1854). Lees concluded from the isnāds contained in the text that Azdī had lived in the second century AH/eighth century CE. Michael Jan de Goeje rejected Lees’ analysis. He argued a) that no biographical source supplied details on Azdī, b) that four of the six transmitters linking Azdī to Silāfī were untraceable as well, and c) that no author earlier than Dḥahabī (d. 747/1347) referred to the work. De Goeje concluded therefore that Azdī had never existed, and that «his» Futūḥ al-Shām was a fraud of the Crusaders’ time, analogous to Futūḥ al-Shām attributed to Wāqīdī. Eventually Lees himself was convinced of de Goeje’s thesis. Emanuel Sivan doubted the analogy between the two works entitled Futūḥ al-Shām. In his

47 See e.g. the «stitches» in Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 115b II. 24-5; 116a I. 11; 116b I. 4.
48 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 14b II. 4-5, whereas in Azdī, 67, the text of the letter is recorded. That letter occurs in Tālamānḵī’s version earlier, on 12a II. 18-21.
49 Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 47a I. 24-48 I. 2, compare to Azdī, 102 II. 3-18. See also Al-durr al-nafis, fol. 61a I. 10 vs. Azdī, 108 II. 1-2.
50 De Goeje, Mémoires, 2nd edition, preface.
opinion Azdī’s Futūh al-Shām was an early work, contrary to pseudo-Wâqidî’s text.\(^1\) The second editor of Azdī’s work, ‘Abd al-Mun‘im ‘Āmir, claimed to have identified Azdī, but his identification is wrong.\(^2\) More recently Lawrence I. Conrad argued quite convincingly that Azdī’s text originated in Syria in the second century AH/eighth century CE. His analysis is based on textual internal criteria of various kinds, and he also found that, prior to Dhahabî, Ibn Khayr al-Ishbîlî (d. 575/1179-80) knew the Futūh al-Shām by Azdī.\(^3\) Conrad was not able to produce new personal details about Azdī.

Conrad has reservations about his own analysis, being as it is based mainly on arguments from silence.\(^4\) His conclusions may now be reinforced by new evidence. First, bio-bibliographical references to Azdī, which were deemed nonexistent, are found in the literature. Secondly, three of the four transmitters deemed unknown (and therefore imaginary) by de Goeje can be traced in the sources. Thirdly, not only the transmitters, but also the transmission of Futūh al-Shām indicate an early date of the text. In what follows I briefly discuss these three points.

a) Bio-bibliographical references to Azdī occur in biographies of some of his authorities. Azdī is listed among those who transmitted from ‘Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal, alongside Abū Mikhnaṣ and Ibn ‘Uyayna, and also among the transmitters from al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd.\(^5\) It should be noted that the sources which mention Azdī are late, namely Mizzī, Dhahabî and Ibn Ḥajar. Azdī’s name is missing from the biographies of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd as recorded in the earlier sources, such as Bukhārī, Ibn Ḥātim, Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Muslim and Ibn Hibbān. However, conclusions from this fact must be drawn with caution, for Azdī is not the only one who was ignored by these early sources. They also fail to mention Abū Mikhnaṣ in the list of transmitters from ‘Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal; nor do they mention Sayf b. ‘Umar as a transmitter from al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd, although the chain Sayf-al-Qāsim occurs many times in Ṭabarî’s History.

b) The unknown transmitters from Azdī to Silaḥ turn out to have been real persons. I have already discussed ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Iṣḥāq and Munīr b. Aḥmad al-Khashshāb.\(^6\) If there was any doubt that Munīr al-Khashshāb had ever

---


\(^2\) See ‘Umarî, Dirāsāt, 71-2 (69-79 are a devastating critique of ‘Āmir’s edition).


\(^5\) Mizzī, Taḥdīḥ, XVIII, 429; Ibn Ḥajar, Taḥdīḥ, VI, 379; Dhahabî, Kāshīf, I, 670 (‘Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal); Mizzī, op. cit. XXIII, 458 (al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd).

\(^6\) See above, p. 366.
existed, at least there is no doubt that he died, because Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Saʿīd al-Ḥabbāl attended his funeral.57 This al-Ḥabbāl is the third link deemed imaginary by de Goeje. In fact he was a very well known traditionist and the author of many books.58 The only one of the four transmitter whom I could not trace is the immediate informant of Silāfī, namely, Aḥmad (or: al-Ḥusayn) b. Muḥammad b. al-Musabbih.59

c) The evidence relating to the transmission of the text is here divided into two groups, one concerns the transmission by Azdī from his sources, the other relates to citations from him by later authors.

Passages transmitted by Azdī on the authority of certain isnāds were transmitted by other second century scholars as well, sometimes with the same isnāds. A few instances follow.

1) The description of the consultations among the Companions prior to the conquest of Syria is quoted by Zuhrī on the authority of al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb-ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Afwā. Precisely the same is adduced by Azdī.60

2) A statement depicting the prowess of Khālid b. al-Walīd is quoted by both Sayf b. ʿUmar and Azdī on the authority of Ismāʿīl b. Abī Khālid- Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim.61

3) A statement identifying al-Muthannā b. Ḥāritha, the Bakrī chief who engaged in raids on Persian territories in 632 CE, is adduced by ʿUmar b. Shabba (d. 262/875) «on the authority of his informants», and by Azdī on the authority of one ʿAbdallāh- his father.62

4) An anecdote depicting a conversation between Khālid b. al-Walīd and ʿAbd al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb b. Faqaym al-Wālibī, unknown to authors of the biographical works, is quoted by both Sayf b. ʿUmar and Abū Mikhnaf, see Tabari, Taʾrikh, IV, 435, 555, 556, etc. (see the index to Tabari’s Taʾrikh).

57 Ḥabbāl, Wafayāt, I, 56.
59 He is called al-Ḥusayn in Silāfī’s version of Azdī, Ahmad in Ibn al-ʿAdīm’s quotations, for which see above, note 16. ʿAmir claims that he died in Futṣṭāt in 513 AH (typically, no reference to any source is given for this information). Ibn Musabbih is not listed among Silāfī’s numerous source, for which see Dhahabī, Siyar, XXI, 5-39.
60 Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrikh Dimashq, II, 63 (cf. 61), Azdī, 1-2 respectively. Al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb b. Faqaym al-Wālibī, unknown to authors of the biographical works, is quoted by both Sayf b. ʿUmar and Abū Mikhnaf, see Tabari, Taʾrikh, IV, 435, 555, 556, etc. (see the index to Tabari’s Taʾrikh).
61 Taʿbarī, Taʾrikh, III, 367 and Ibn Ḥubaysh, II, 41 (=419), Azdī, 66, respectively. Ismāʿīl is a well known traditionist who died in 145/762-3 or 146/763-4, see Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Tahākurrā, I, 153; ʿUmar, Maʾrūfat al-thiqāt, I, 224. Ismāʿīl is known to have transmitted from the Successor (ṭāhīʿi) Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim on whom see Ibn Ḥajar, Isāba, III, 266.
62 Ibn Ḥubaysh, Ghusawāt, II, 6 (384), Azdī, 53 respectively.
63 Taʿbarī, ibid., III, 345, Azdī, 64, respectively. Ḥamza b. ʿAlī b. Mukkfīr or Muḥaffīz, is an obscure figure. He did, however, supply information not only to Abū Mikhnaf but also to Sayf b.
5) Abu Mikhnaf quotes a letter from Khālid b. al-Walīd to the people of al-Madā’in, on the authority of Sha’bî - al-Mujālid b. Saʿîd. Azdī quotes the same letter on the authority of Sha’bî - al-Mujālid b. Saʿîd and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd. All three links, i.e. ‘Āmir al-Sha’bî, al-Mujālid b. Saʿîd and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd are well known. Al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd is also cited by Sayf b. ‘Umar on a number of occasions.

William Nassau Lees and Akram Diyā’ al-‘Umarî placed Azdī in the second century merely on the basis of the death dates of his authorities. Isnīds, as is well known, may be forged. Therefore, the above-mentioned passages are much stronger evidence of Azdī’s time. They prove that not only the sources, but also the actual material was shared by Azdī and other, much more well-known second century authors. The biographical works tend to deal with scholars of the religious sciences and to neglect the historians, a fact that accounts for the lack of biographical details about them. As already mentioned, the early biographical sources ignored not only Azdī but also Abû Mikhnaf and Sayf b. ‘Umar. As a matter of fact not only Azdī is obscure. Very few details are known about Sayf b. ‘Umar too, yet his existence was never placed under any doubt.

The known citations from Azdī’s Futūḥ al-Shām and the references to it occur in late sources (Ibn Ḥajar, d. 859/1445-6, Dhahabî, d. 747/1347), which led de Goeje to the conclusion that the work was a late fraud. As already mentioned, Conrad found a reference to Azdī in Ibn Khayr (575/1179-80). But there are quotations from Azdī already in the third century AH/ninth century CE. The traditionist and historian Abû Bishr al-Dūlābî quotes two passages on the authority of al-Walîd b. Ḥammād - al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād - Azdī, namely, the same chain that transmitted Futūḥ al-Shām. Dūlābî indeed is known to have transmitted directly from al-Walîd b. Ḥammād (d. around 300/912-3). One of these two passages is found independently in two sources, namely, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s Isī‘āb and Ibn ‘Asākir’s Ta’rikh Dimashq. Although I could not trace it in any of the extant texts of Futūḥ al-Shām (including Ṭalamankî’s), I believe that it is taken from

"Umar, see Tabarî, ibid., 470 (also on the authority of a man of the tribe of Bakr b. Wā’il). He is defined as "unknown" (majhûl), see Husaynî, Ibnāl, I, 107. I could not trace Abû al-Muthannâ al-Kalbî.

64 Tabarî, Ta’rikh, III, 346, and Azdī, 66, respectively.
65 See the index to Tabarî’s Ta’rikh.
66 See above, p. 373.
67 See above, p. 373.
68 Dhahabî, Siyar XIV, 78.
69 Ibn ‘Asākir does sometimes quote Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, but this particular passage from Dūlābî reached him through other sources. See Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rikh Dimashq, LXV, 252 (with the full isnād from Dūlābî to Ibn ‘Asākir); Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Isī‘āb, III, 1417.
that work, as it deals with the appointment of Mu‘awiya over Syria. The other passage quoted by Dùlàbî is found in Ibn ‘Asàkir, and in Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām.\(^{70}\) On the basis of these two passages alone, quoted by Dùlàbî who died in 310/922-3, it is clear that Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām existed as early as the turn of the fourth century AH/tenth century CE. There is in fact no reason to doubt that it originated in the second century.

The decisive evidence, however, is Al-durr al-nafis. In it we have Ṭalamankī reproducing large parts of Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām, with the upper (older) part of the isnād identical with the one known from the extant, much later version of Silāfī. Ṭalamankī died in 429/1037, long before the Crusades were even thought of. The thesis that Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām is a fraud of the Crusaders’ time is indubitably untenable.

There remains one problem to account for, namely, the attitude of the Andalusian scholar Ibn Ḥubaysh to Azdî’s text. One hundred and fifty years after Ṭalamankī, Ibn Ḥubaysh (d. 585/1188) used Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām but refused to mention Azdî’s name. Listing his sources, Ibn Ḥubaysh mentioned Kitāb al-ridda by Wāqidī, the Ta’rikh by Ṭabarî, Al-ridda wa-l-futūh by Sayf b. ‘Umar, and «the book entitled The conquest of Syria (Futūh al-Shām), of which I saw several copies, each attributed to a [different] author».\(^{71}\) Throughout the text, when quoting Azdî, Ibn Ḥubaysh always mentions the name of the book, never the name of the author.\(^{72}\) Does it mean that one hundred and fifty years after Ṭalamankī the attribution of this Futūh al-Shām was disputed? This does not seem likely to me. Perhaps Ibn Ḥubaysh was confused by the fact that the title Futūh al-Shām was used by two different texts, the one by pseudo Wāqidī and the other by Azdî. At any rate, as far as I could see, the passages he quoted from Futūh al-Shām are found in Azdî’s text.

The fact that Ṭalamankī merely reproduced Azdî’s Futūh al-Shām does not mean that his work is unimportant. On the contrary, it is precisely this fact that lends great significance to Ṭalamankī’s compilation, and to the manuscript of Al-durr al-nafis which reproduces parts of it. First, these works settle the controversy regarding Azdî’s text. Secondly, Al-durr al-nafis supplies an additional version of Futūh al-Shām, hitherto unknown. The importance of an additional version to a future scholarly edition of Futūh al-Shām is incontestable.

\(^{70}\) Azdî, Futūh al-Shām, 149; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rikh Dimashq, VII, 464 (isnād identical with the former, see previous note).

\(^{71}\) Ibn Ḥubaysh, Ghazawāt, I, 9.

\(^{72}\) See e.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, I, 143, 147-8, 173, 184-6 = Azdî, 2, 8, 51-2, 70-3, respectively.
APPENDIX

Following is a list of all the quotations from Talamankî recorded in *Al-durr al-nafis*, collated with their parallels in *Futûh al-Shàm* (*'Amir’s edition*). I do not comment on the variations between the texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Al-durr al-nafis</em></th>
<th><em>Futûh al-Shàm</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b, line 19-2a, line 5</td>
<td>2, line 10-3, line 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b, ll. 9-15</td>
<td>50, ll. 15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b, l. 15-8a, l. 6</td>
<td>51, l. 2-52 ult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a ll. 18-21</td>
<td>67 ll. 16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b ll. 5-14a l. 7</td>
<td>53 ll. 11-62 l. 2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63 ll. 10-64 l. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a ll. 8-15</td>
<td>65 ll. 1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a l.20-14b l. 4</td>
<td>66 l. 12-67 l. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b ll. 22-26</td>
<td>69 ult.-71 l. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b l. 26-15a l. 16</td>
<td>71 l. 2-72 l. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a ll. 16-9</td>
<td>72 l. 18-73 l. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a l. 19-15b l. 10</td>
<td>73 l. 6-75 l. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a l. 24-16b l. 7</td>
<td>78 l. 5-79 l. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b ll. 7-15</td>
<td>79 l. 6-80 l. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b ll. 15-24</td>
<td>72 ll. 10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a l. 20-28b l. 1</td>
<td>86 ll. 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b ll. 1-9</td>
<td>85 ll. 1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b ll. 9-13</td>
<td>87 ll. 1-88 l. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a l. 17-44b l. 12</td>
<td>88 l. 19-89 l. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b ll. 12-18</td>
<td>95 l. 6-97 l. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47a l. 12-47b l. 14</td>
<td>97 l. 9-98 l. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47b l. 14-48a l. 12</td>
<td>98 l. 5-101 l. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54b l. 25-55a l. 14</td>
<td>101 l. 1-102 l. 18(^{73})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60b l. 19-61b l. 9</td>
<td>102-103 (great variations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61b l.9-65a l. 4</td>
<td>106 l. 14-110 l. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65a l. 4-67b l. 14</td>
<td>111 l. 1-130 l. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72a ll. 6-21</td>
<td>130 l. 1-144 l. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79a l. 25-79b l. 4</td>
<td>144 l. 1-20-146 l. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79b l. 5-80a l. 8</td>
<td>149 ll. 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80a l. 8-80b l. 8</td>
<td>146 l. 5-148 l. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80b l. 19-84a l. 7</td>
<td>149 l. 12-152 l. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84a l. 16-84b l. 16</td>
<td>152 l. 13-168 l. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b ll. 16-25</td>
<td>169 l. 15-172 l. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b l. 25-85a l. 13</td>
<td>187 l. 14-188 l. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86b l. 15-87a l. 1</td>
<td>174 l. 3-175 l. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186 l. 3-187 l. 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{73}\) See above note 39.


14 I am not sure that this is the parallel. Both texts identify Ka‘b al-Ahbar but each of them says something different.

15 End of Azdî in Silafî’s version.

16 End of *Al-durr al-naﬁs.*
ABSTRACT

The anonymous manuscript XCIII of the Gayangos collection is a compilation consisting of parts of two works: Futūḥ al-Shām by (ps.) al-Wāqidī, and an unnamed work by Abū 'Umar al-Ṭalamankî. A close examination of the text reveals that Ṭalamankî’s «compilation» was not an original work by him, but a transmission of the controversial text by Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdî, also entitled Futūḥ al-Shām. Azdî’s work was considered by many scholars as a fraud of the Crusaders’ time. Its transmission by Ṭalamankî, who died decades before the first Crusade, settles the controversy once and for all: Azdî’s work is early. Other newly discovered quotations from Azdî support this conclusion. The garbled isnāds in the anonymous manuscript were investigated. Their upper (older) links turned out to be accurately matching the isnāds in Azdî’s work. The latter were investigated too, and most of the hitherto obscure links in them were identified. The manuscript text was collated with the extant, published versions of Azdî’s Futūḥ al-Shām, revealing countless minor variations, which proves that Azdî’s work was transmitted in more than one version (riwāya). The collation of the texts, coupled with an analysis of the methodologies apparent in the manuscript, unveil some processes relating to the making of texts.

RESUMEN

El manuscrito anónimo n.º XVIII de la colección Gayangos es una compilación que consiste en partes de dos obras: Futūḥ al-Shām de (ps.) al-Wāqidī y una obra sin título de Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalamankî. Un análisis del texto revela que la «compilación» de Ṭalamankî no es una obra original suya, sino una transmisión del controvertido texto de Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdî, también titulado Futūḥ al-Shām. La obra de al-Azdî fue considerada por muchos estudiosos como un fraude de la época de las Cruzadas. La transmisión de al-Ṭalamankî, que murió décadas antes de la Primera Cruzada, demuestra que la obra de al-Azdî es más temprana, dando de ese modo fin a la controversia. Otras citas de al-Azdî recién descubiertas también apoyan esta conclusión. También se investigan los isnāds del manuscrito anónimo cuyos eslabones más antiguos coinciden con los de la obra de al-Azdî, algunos de los cuales, hasta ahora desconocidos, identificamos. El texto manuscrito es cotejado con las versiones publicadas de Futūḥ al-Shām de al-Azdî y las innumerables variantes prueban que esta obra se transmitió en varias versiones (riwāya). El análisis del manuscrito y el cotejo desvelan algunos de los procesos que intervienen en la construcción de los textos.