ON THE RECONSTRUCTION OF LOST SOURCES [1]

ELLA LANDAU-TASSERON
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

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 Isḥāq (d. 150/767) and al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) [2], and in 1898 a book was published on the sources of the *Mu'jam al-buldān* of Yāqūt (d. 626/1229) [3]. 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 Isḥāq, [4] Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/773), [5] al-Azdī (fl. ca. 180/796), [6] Sayf ibn 'Umar (d. 180/796), [7] al-Haytham ibn 'Adī (d. 207/822), [8]

[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.

[2] Sprenger, "Notes" esp. 61, 207-13.

[3] Heer, *Historischen und geographischen Quellen.*

[4] Fück, *Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq.;* al-Samūk, *Die historischen Überlieferungen.*

[5] Sezgin, U., *Abū Mikhnaf;* idem, "Abū Mikhnaf".

[6] Conrad, "Al-Azdī".

[7] Hinds, "Sayf".

[8] Leder, *Das Korpus.*

Al-Qanṭara XXV, 1 (2004) 45-91

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

al-Madā'inī (d. 225/840), [9] al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), [10] al-Balādhurī (d. 279/892), [11] Ibn Abī l-Dunyā (d. 281/894), [12] al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), [13] Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi (d. 328/940), [14] Saʿīd ibn Baṭrīq (d. 328/940), [15] al-Masʿūdī (d. 345/956), [16] Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī (d. 356/967), [17] al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071), [18] and Mawhūb ibn Manṣūr ibn Mufarrij (fifth/eleventh century). [19]

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 *isnāds,* 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. [20] 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. [21]

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. [22]

[9] Rotter, "Zur Überlieferung".
[10] Sezgin F., *"Bukhārī 'nin".*
[11] Athamina, "Sources"; al-Mashhadānī, *Mawārid.*
[12] Bellamy, "Sources".
[13] 'Alī, "Mawārid".
[14] Werkmeister, *Quellenuntersuchungen;* idem, "Parallelstellen-Verzeichnis".
[15] Breydy, *Études.*
[16] Khalidi, *Islamic Historiography*; Shboul, *Al-Masʿūdī.*
[17] Zolondek, "An approach"; *idem,* "The sources"; Fleischhammer, "Quellenuntersuchungen"; Günther, *Quellenuntersuchungen.*
[18] Al-'Umarī, *Dirāsāt,* 143-219, see also 81-115.
[19] Den Heijer, *Mawhūb.*
[20] Sezgin, F., *GAS,* I, 19, 82-4, 237-56, 399.
[21] Schoeler "'Die Frage", 202-203, 215, 223. See also Bellamy, "Sources of Ibn Abī al-Dunyā", and al-'Umarī's critical remarks in his *Dirāsāt,* 236-7.
[22] See nn. 7, 12 above; Sezgin, U., *Abū Mikhnaf,* 99-187; Rotter, "Überlieferung", *passim.* See also *GAS,* I, 82 n. 4.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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. [23] Partial reconstructions of the works of several authors were made by 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī. [24] Wilhelm Hoenerbach gleaned from the *Iṣāba* of Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449) all the fragments of the *Kitāb al-ridda* by Wathīma ibn Mūsā (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. [25]

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. Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/740). Ḥusayn 'Aṭwān has made inventories of the fragments which he found under the name of al-Zuhrī, and Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-A'ẓamī has prepared a full-scale reconstruction of 'Urwa's *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. [26] 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. [27] 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.

[23] Sprenger, "Notes"; *idem,* "Writing down historical facts", 303-29, 375-81; Horovitz, "The earliest biographies".

[24] Dūrī, *Baḥth,* 64-78 ('Urwa, d. 94/712), 82-92 (al-Zuhrī, d. 124/740), 108-109 (Wahb, d. 110/728); cf. also the excerpts collected, 138-42 ('Urwa), 143-51 (al-Zuhrī), 115-7 and 152-8 (Wahb), 159-65 (Mūsā b. 'Uqba, d. 141/758), 215-31 (Abū Mikhnaf), 232-47 ('Awāna, d. 147/764), 248-55 (Sayf), 270-91 (al-Madā'inī, 292-311 (Ibn al-Kalbī, d. 204/819), 319-25 (al-Haytham b. 'Adī), 166-86 (Ibn Isḥāq).

[25] Hoenerbach, *Wathīma,* 122. The sources in question are al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda* and Ibn Ḥubaysh's *Kitāb al-ghazawāt,* both of which will be discussed below. Cf. however, Hoenerbach 's doubts, *ibid.* 226, 235-40.

[26] 'Aṭwān, *Al-riwāya,* 116-35, 148-53, 155-67; al-A'ẓamī, *Maghāzī.* See also Faruqi, *Historiography,* 224-60; Ibrāhīm, "'Urwa", 76-80; Mursī, "'Urwa".

[27] Cf. Caetani, *Annali,* II, 550, n.° 70.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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. [28] 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". [29] 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. [30]

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, [31] interpolations of foreign material, which are less obvious, may be more widespread than is usually suspected.

[28] See Sprenger, "Writing down historical facts", 320; Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *'Ulūm,* 261; Aḥmad, *Dalā'il,* 331, 450. For contradictory opinions about Abū Hurayra's views concerning the writing down of *ḥadīth* see Aḥmad, *ibid.,* 431-37.

[29] See Codera *Index,* II, 526. For typical *musnads,* see Abū Ya'lā al-Mawsilī, *Musnad*; al-Ṭabarānī, *Al-mu'jam al-kabīr;* al-Mizzī, *Tuḥfa.*

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

[31] Rosenthal, *Technique,* 46.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

A few examples may illustrate this statement. The Vienna manuscript of al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, which was discovered by Von Kremer and edited by him in 1855, contains a passage transmitted on the authority of Ibn Isḥāq. It appears to be an integral part of al-Wāqidī's text. Von Kremer identified the passage as an interpolation on the ground that nowhere else in the *Maghāzī* does al-Wāqidī refer to Ibn Isḥāq. 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 Isḥāq is made. [32] A second case is the Berlin fragment of the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* by Mūsā 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'rīkh* of Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ (d. 240/854), which contains additions by the transmitter Baqiyy b. Makhlad (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 *isnāds*. [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. Khalīfa's transmitter, for instance, did not intend to cheat. This much is clear from the fact that he sometimes inserted the words *qāla Khalīfa*, "Khalīfa said", after the passages which he added, thereby indicating resumption of Khalīfa'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]

[32] Al-Wāqidī, *Maghāzī,* ed. von Kremer, introduction, 5, text, 7:10-9:2, as compared with Jones' edition, I, 6pu-16:16.

[33] Sachau, "Das berliner Fragment", 449. Schacht, "On Mūsā ibn 'Uqba's *Kitāb al-maghāzī*".

[34] Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, *Ta'rīkh,* introduction 46-7, text 226, 260, 261, 262, 264, 267, 268.

[35] Sprenger, "Notes", 61; Rotter, "Überlieferung", 108; Schoeler, "Schriftliche oder mündliche Überlieferung", 213-22; Leder, *Korpus al-Haitham,* esp. 53-139; idem. "Fea-

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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 *Kitāb al-aghānī* a statement that al-Iṣfahānī had copied from "a book of al-Ḥaramī b. al-'Alā' on the authority of al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār" (*nasakhtu min kitāb al-Ḥaramī b. al-'Alā' 'an al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār),* he sensed a problem: was al-Iṣfahānī copying from a work of Ibn Bakkār transmitted by al-Ḥaramī, or was he copying from an independent work by al-Ḥaramī, who was using Ibn Bakkār as his authority? [36] Similarly, Rotter found that the boundaries between the writings of al-Madā'inī and his transmitters were somewhat obscure. [37] By comparison, al-A'ẓamī'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'ẓamī'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 *qirā'a* 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

tures". See also al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Al-madkhal,* 41-2, where such practices are condemned.

[36] Zolondek, "The sources", 301. cf. 297; Leder, "Features", 81-2.

[37] Rotter, "Überlieferung", 110-11, 124, 130. Cf. a similar problem raised by Fuat Sezgin in connection with Abū Mikhnaf in *GAS,* I, 309. Generally, however, Sezgin considers that his method provides the means for distinguishing between authors and transmitters, ibid., I, 82.

[38] Al-A'ẓāmī, *Maghāzī,* 59; see also Leder, "Features", 74-5.

[39] *GAS,* I, 59; Sprenger, "Writing down historical facts", 328-9. This method is also called *'arḍ,* see Abbott, *Studies,* II, 35.

[40] *GAS,* I, 240.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

upon. The traditionist 'Abd Allāh b. Lahī'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 Ḥaywa b. Shurayḥ bequeathed his books to someone who then proceeded to copy from the books the *ḥadīths* from the teachers who had taught both the deceased Ḥaywa and Ibn Lahī'a. He then read the material to Ibn Lahī'a, who gave him permission to transmit it in his (Ibn Lahī'a name), even though Ibn Lahī'a had never heard these particular *ḥadīths* from his teachers. Because of this practice Ḥaywa's heir was considered "a man who does not fear God". [41] 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-Zuhrī, whose names are more likely than others to have been used by forgers. Sprenger already doubted whether the *sīra* ascribed to al-Zuhrī 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". [42] 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-Zuhrī, several other important *muḥaddithūn* are said to have had nephews who acted as transmitters of their works. Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Wahb (d. 264/877), nephew of 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d.197/812), is of particular interest in this connection. He was mistrusted because he transmitted the *Kitāb al-fitan* on the authority of his uncle, whereas some scholars denied that Ibn Wahb ever trans-

[41] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* V, 375, 378, 379. See also al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Al-madkhal,* 39-41. Rotter, "Überlieferung", mentions traditionists who forgot material which they had previously taught. Note that *kitāb, kutub* can refer to any written text, not necessarily to a book, see Aḥmad, *Al-tawthīq,* 318-26.

[42] Sprenger, "Notes", 213.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

mitted such a book to anyone. This denial seems to imply that the existence of the *Kitāb al-fitan* was not universally recognized. [43]

The *Kitāb al-maghāzī* of 'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr, reconstructed by al-A'ẓamī, 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-sīra),* but all these sources are late: Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282), Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449), al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), and Ḥājjī Khalīfa (d. 1069/1658). Ibn Kathīr quotes al-Wāqidī as stating that 'Urwa was the first to compile a *maghāzī* work; [44] but Ibn Kathīr lived in the eighth/fourteenth century, and there is no way to determine whether or not this quotation from al-Wāqidī is genuine. In the fourth/tenth century, almost two centuries after al-Wāqidī's time, Ibn al-Nadīm did not list 'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr among the authors of *maghāzī* books. All he has to offer in this connection is a reference to Abū Ḥassān al-Ḥasan b. 'Uthmān al-Ziyādī (d. 243/857), concerning whom he writes: "and a book of his is the *Maghāzī* of 'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr" (*wa-lahu min al-kutub Kitāb maghāzī 'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr*). In Ibn al-Nadīm's terminology this means that Abū Ḥassān was the compiler of a book entitled *Maghāzī '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-Dhahabī (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 *Kitāb al-maghāzī.* [46] There is, however, another story according to which 'Urwa, during the battle of al-Ḥarra (64/683), burned *fiqh*

[43] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* I, 55-6. For nephews of other scholars see al-A'ẓamī, *Maghāzī,* 64; Schacht, "Mūsā ibn 'Uqba", 293; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist,* I, 226; *GAS,* I, 284; 'Aṭwān, *Al-riwāya,* 181, 185; Sprenger, "Notes", 213. In all of these cases the uncle is the *'amm,* the father's brother.

[44] Al-A'ẓamī, *Maghāzī,* 57.

[45] Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist,* 110 (read *maghāzī* for the editor's *ma'ānī*), cf. 226, where 'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad is credited with a *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, whereas Horovitz, "Biographies", 43, maintains that he merely transmitted his uncle's work; see also *GAS,* I, 284. On al-Ziyādī see al-'Umarī, *Dirāsāt,* 148, 208.

[46] Sprenger, "Notes", 208; see also Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* V, 183.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

books which he owned (i.e. not a work compiled by him), an act he reportedly regretted later. [47] 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 *ḥadīth*. [48] 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 *muḥaddithūn* 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-'Azīz, probably belong to the same category (although Sezgin interprets them as straightforward evidence for the early existence of books). [49]

What emerges from this is the possibility that a complete book by 'Urwa on the *maghāzī* perhaps was not lost, but rather never existed in the first place. Indeed, the Iraqi Shī'ī Ḥasan al-Ṣadr (end of the nineteenth-early twentieth cent.) held that the first scholar to write a *sīra* was Ibn Isḥāq, who was a Shī'ī. According to al-Ṣadr, this fact was deliberately obfuscated, and the claim was set forth that it was 'Urwa – not a Shī'ī- who first compiled a *maghāzī* book. [50] Al-Ṣadr 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, Hishām (d. 146/763), was accused of ascribing to his father material which he had never directly received from him. [51]

There remains one matter to account for, namely the quotations which explicitly mention *Maghāzī 'Urwa*. Judging from the material assembled by al-A'ẓamī, it appears that Ibn Ḥajar is the only author

[47] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* V, 183; Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt,* V, 133.

[48] Sprenger, "Writing down historical facts"; *idem,* "Notes", 210-ll; Goldziher, *Muslim Studies,* II, 19-24, 184-88; *GAS,* I, 53-55; Schoeler, "Schriftliche"; Aḥmad, *Al-Tawthīq,* 203-37.

[49] *GAS,* I, 64. For similar stories see Sprenger, "Writing down historical facts", 311-14; Abbott, *Studies,* II, 50; Aḥmad, *Al-tawthīq,* 239-46; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* V, 376 and VI, 351; al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Madkhal,* 42 (text), 41 (trans.). Among the famous scholars said to have lost or destroyed their books are 'Abdallāh b. Lahī 'a and al-Awzā'ī (d. 157/773); note that the stories are about early scholars only.

[50] Al-Ṣadr, *Al-shī'a,* 60.

[51] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* XI, 50.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

who mentions this title. [52] 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. [53] 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". [54]

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", [55] 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-

[52] Al-A'ẓamī, *Maghāzī,* 59.
[53] See below.
[54] Al-A'ẓamī, *Maghāzī,* 59, and above.
[55] Abbott, *Studies,* I, 7.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

ing of the texts. [56] 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. [57] Sprenger had already noticed that al-Wāqidī's material as quoted by al-Ṭabarī is not identical with al-Wāqidī's text as edited by Von Kremer. [58] The same phenomenon has been observed regarding other medieval authors, [59] 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. [60] Rotter too considered the possibilily of additions and changes introduced into al-Madā'inī'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-Madā'inī's works. [61]

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. [62] 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. [63] 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, *Wathīma,* 236-40; Bellamy, "Sources", 3. This is in contrast with U. Sezgin in *Abū Mikhnaf,* where the accuracy of the Muslim scholars is emphasized.

[57] Leder, "Features"; *idem, Korpus al-Haitham,* esp. chaps. 3-6; *idem,* "Authorship"; Conrad, "Arwād". See also Schoeler, "Schriftliche", 203.

[58] Sprenger, "Notes", 62.

[59] Schoeler, "Schriftliche", 202-203; Rotter, "Überlieferung", 108, 117-22; Hoenerbach, *Wathīma,* 225, 236.

[60] Rosenthal, *Technique,* 30-34.

[61] Rotter, "Überlieferung", 108, 109, 117, 119, 122.

[62] Schoeler, "Schriftliche", 202-203.

[63] *Ibid.,* 227; before him, Pedersen, *The Arabic Book,* chap. 3, esp. 24-27.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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 Isḥāq 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 *wijāda* 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-Ṭabarī derived directly from al-Madā'inī'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, "Idjāza"; Samarrā'ī, "Al-ijāza".

[65] On *wijāda* see Sprenger, "Notes", 53-4; *GAS,* I, 59-60.

[66] Rotter, "Überlieferung", 109, 122, 132.

[67] Schoeler, "Schriftliche", 226-7.

[68] *Ibid.,* 227, note 111.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

al-Diyārbakrī, al-Kalā'ī, and Ibn Ḥubaysh. [69] 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. [70]

Al-Diyārbakrī

The *faqīh* and historian Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Diyārbakrī lived in Mecca in tbe tenth/sixteenth century (d. 966/1559, or 982/1574). [71] His book *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs fī aḥwāl anfas nafīs* is a compilation of materials concerning the life of Muḥammad, appended by a short history of the caliphates from Abū Bakr to the Mamluks in Egypt. [72] 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 *wijāda* 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 *fī,* "in", followed by a book title, as in *wa-fī al-mawāhib al-lāduniyya,* or *dhakara/dhukira fī ("*he stated/it was stated in....) Occasionally *fī* is followed by the name of an author, as in *wa-fī al-Bukhārī...*
2. The verb *qāla,* "he said", or *dhakara,* "he stated", followed by the name of an authority, as in *qāla Ibn Isḥāq...*or *qāla Ibn Jarīr...*
3. The preposition *'an,* "from", or "on the authority of", followed by the name of an authority, for example: *'an Ibn al-Kalbī, or 'an Ibn 'Abbās.*

[69] Al-Diyārbakrī, *Ta'rīkh;* al-Kalā'ī, *Ta'rīkh;* 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.

[70] Cf. discussions of terminology of transmission in Sezgin, U., *Abū Mikhnaf,* 34-8, 43-6; Rotter, "Überlieferung", 106, 109 and *passim.*

[71] See Zaydān, *Ta'rīkh,* III, 308.

[72] The Cairo edition contains about 900 pages in two volumes; about 700 of these are *sīra,* the rest is the short history.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

Sometimes combined references occur, such as *wa-fī al-Ḥadā'iq 'an Abī Hurayra...*("and in the *Ḥadā'iq,* on the authority of Abū Hurayra..."). Such references indicate both al-Diyārbakrī'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 *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs* not every indication of a source (*wa-fī,* 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-Diyārbakrī incorporated into the text what we may call second- (or third- etc.) hand quotations. When he wrote *wa-'an 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-Diyārbakrī'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-Diyārbakrī, in the late tenth/sixteenth century, consulted these early books, a view advocated by Sachau when he suggests that al-Diyārbakrī made use of the now-lost *Maghāzī* of Mūsā ibn 'Uqba, which is cited in the main (*sīra*) part of the *Ta'rīkh 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-iktifā'* by al-Kalā'ī (d. 634/1237).

A full collation of the *ridda* texts in the *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs* and the *Iktifā'* demonstrates that al-Diyārbakrī copied most of al-Kalā'ī'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-Kalā'īs references to

[73] Rosenthal, *Technique,* 39.

[74] Sachau, "Mūsā ibn 'Uḳba", 449.

[75] Al-Diyārbakrī, II, 215:1=al-Kalā'ī, 87:9. Al-Kalā'ī in turn copied this remark from Ibn Ḥubaysh, 46:8 (=ed. I, 120).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

the early sources, and al-Diyārbakrī only once indicates that his references are second-hand: "and in the *Iktifā'*, on the authority of Ibn Isḥāq...". [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 Isḥāq
2. the book of Ya'qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī
3. al-Kalbī
4. the book of al-Wāqidī (that is, his *Kitāb al-ridda)*
5. the book of Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī.

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

	Al-Diyārbakrī, II	Al-Kalā'ī
Wa-fī al-iktifā' qāla Ibn Isḥāq/qāla Ibn Isḥāq	201:1	1:3
Wa-dhakara Ibn Isḥāq	203:27	16:4
Qāla Ibn Isḥāq	207:3	35:10
Wa-dhakara Ibn Isḥāq	207:18	37:5
Wa-dhakara Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhrī	201:26	2:10
Wa-fī kitāb Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī	207:16 [79]	37:1
Wa-fī kitāb al-Zuhrī	207:26-7	39:8
Wa-fī kitāb Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī	220:2	124:7-8
Wa-fīmā dhakarahu al-Kalbī 'an ba'ḍ al-ṭā'iyyīn	206:29	37:12
Wa-fī kitāb al-Wāqidī min qawl 'Umar	202:1	4:3
Wa-dhakara al-Wāqidī 'an Ibn 'Umar	206:33	35:1 [80]
Wa-huwa mā dhakarahu al-Wāqidī 'an 'Umayla	207:20	38:6
Al-Wāqidī 'an Ya'qūb ibn Zayd (Yazīd)	207:33	41:1
Wa-dhakara al-Wāqidī	211:4	71:2
Qāla al-Wāqidī	212:12	78:15
Rawāhu al-Wāqidī	213:9	123:8
Wa-fī kitāb Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd	211:20	75:3

[76] Al-Diyarbakrī, 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 "Abī Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī".

[80] Here al-Kalā'ī has two disparate traditions from Ibn 'Umar, separated by the words *wa-'anhu qāla,* see below, next page.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

It is noteworthy that al-Diyārbakrī copied the references as they were, including the formula *wa-fī kitāb,* 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-Diyārbakrī drew heavily on the *Iktifā',* his work is not a replica of al-Kalā'ī's. First, he occasionally broke al-Kalā'ī'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-Diyārbakrī rarely made abridgments and paraphrases, [81] 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-Kalā'ī arranges two accounts from Ibn 'Umar in succession, separating them with the words *wa-'anhu qāla, "*and also ascribed to him are the following words...". The passage runs as follows:

> Al-Wāqidī relates an account attributed to Ibn 'Umar: "I watched the flag of Ṭulayḥa on that day; it was red, carried by one of their men who never let go. I watched Khālid 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 qala*): "God have mercy upon Khālid b. al-Walīd, he was courageous and adequate. I saw him at the battle against Ṭulayḥa, where he joined in the fighting himself until he was rebuked for it" (that is, for endangering himself)... [82]

In al-Kalā'ī's text it is evident that the first of these two accounts is quoted from al-Wāqidī, 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 qāla* clearly refers to the purported eyewit-

[81] E.g. al-Diyārbakrī, II, 205:13-20.
[82] Al-Kalā'ī, 35:1-7.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

ness, Ibn 'Umar, and not to al-Wāqidī. Incidentally, it appears from al-Kalā'ī's source, Ibn Ḥubaysh, that the two accounts were indeed taken from al-Wāqidī, but in all probability they did not originally occur in succession. [83] Al-Kalā'ī still retained the original independence of the two traditions by separating them with *wa-'anhu qāla,* but when al-Diyārbakrī copied from al-Kalā'ī he omitted these two words, together with the line that follows. The result is that the two originally disparate passages became one continuous account. [84]

Several conclusions may be drawn from the collation of the texts on the *ridda* in the books of al-Diyārbakrī and al-Kalā'ī:

1. Al-Diyārbakrī apparently never set eyes on the original books of Ibn Isḥāq, al-Kalbī, al-Zuhrī or al-Umawī, or on the *Kitāb al-ridda* by al-Wāqidī. Since al-Diyārbakrī also copied the formula *wa-fī kitāb,* "and in the book of...", his terminology of transmission gives no clue to his immediate sources. [85] But such a clue is provided by his introduction to the *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs,* which proves that he had no fraudulent intentions. In his introductory list of sources al-Diyārbakrī includes al-Kalā'ī'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 *Ta'rīkh* 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. [86]

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

[83] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 20:25 (=ed. I, 53): *wa-'an 'Abdallāh ibn 'Umar fī kitāb al-Wāqidī....wa-fīhi 'an Ibn 'Umar...*On *wa-fīhi* see below.

[84] Al-Diyārbakrī, II, 206:33-207:2.

[85] Cf. Rotter, "Überlieferung", 106-109, 116.

[86] Cf. Hoenerbach, *Wathīma,* 236.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

reworking made by the later author. [87] This rule does not apply to the *Ta'rīkh 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-Kalā'ī's *Iktifā'* being one of them). If anything could be reconstructed from al-Diyārbakrī's text, it would not be the second-century sources he mentions, but rather the book which he directly used, that is, the *Kitāb al-iktifā'*. As it happens, the *Iktifā'* is extant.

Al-Kalā'ī

Sulaymān b. Mūsā al-Kalā'ī was a man of letters, poet, orator, and a scholar of *ḥadīth, rijāl,* and history. He lived in Islamic Spain, where, at the age of 70, he died in battle against the Christians in 634/1237. [88] Of his numerous books none seems to have survived except the *Kitāb al-iktifā' fī maghāzī al-muṣṭafā wa-l-thalātha al-khulafā',* 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 *Iktifā'* have hitherto been published, each of them twice. The volume on the *sīra* was published by Henri Massé, and by Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Wāḥid. [89] The part on the *ridda* was published hy Khurshīd Fāriq, under the title *Ta'rīkh al-ridda,* and by Aḥmad Ghunaym, under the title *Al-khilāfa al-rāshida wa-l-buṭūla al-khālida fī ḥurūb al-ridda*. [90] All four editors attach great value to the *Kitāb al-iktifā'* 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-Wāqidī. [91] According to Fāriq and Ghunaym, al-Kalā'ī not only used second-century sources directly but also stated the fact in his introduction. Ghunaym mentions in this con-

[87] Bellamy, "Sources", 3.

[88] Al-Kalā'ī, *Iktifā',* ed. Massé, 8-47; ed. 'Abd al-Wāḥid, Introduction, *zā'-kaf;* ed. Fāriq, Introduction, 2-3.

[89] 'Abd al-Wāḥid severely criticized Massé's edition, see his introduction, *'ayn.*

[90] Ghunaym was not aware of Fāriq's edition, and repeats his claim that he was the first to publish the volume, see his introduction, 7, 8, 22.

[91] Al-Kalā'ī, ed. Massé, Introduction, 6; ed. 'Abd al-Wāḥid, Introduction, *mīm*; ed. Ghunaym, 8-9; ed. Fāriq, Introduction, 9-11; Fāriq, "A valuable manuscript"; Muranyi, "Ein neuer Bericht", 259.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

nection the "lost book about the *ridda* by Ibn Isḥāq, the likewise-lost book of al-Wāqidī on the *ridda,* the writings of Ya'qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī and Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī, as well as a lost book whose author is semi anonymous...i.e. Wathīma ibn Mūsā's *Kitāb* al-*ridda*". [92] Fāriq writes that al-Kalā'ī recorded otherwise-unknown details "from sources which are still unknown/unavailable, and which are perhaps (irretrievably) lost". According to Fāriq, al-Kalā'ī named a few of these sources in his introduction, as follows:

1. The book of al-Wāqidī; this is how the author referred to it. There is no doubt that what is meant is al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda,* mentioned by Ibn al-Nadīm.
2. The book of Ya'qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī...
3. The book of al-Umawī; perhaps this refers to Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī, d. AH 194...
4. The *Kitāb al-ridda* by Wathīma... [93]

These statements by Ghunaym and Fāriq seem to be wrong. In the introduction to the *Iktifā'* as recorded in the two editions of the first volume, as well as in Fāriq's own introduction, [94] al-Kalā'ī never mentions any of these books. Although he lists Ibn Isḥāq (or rather Ibn Hishām), al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-mab'ath,* and Mūsā ibn 'Uqba among his sources for the *sīra,* he draws his material on the *ridda* from late sources. These are, to quote his own words,"the book of our shaykh, the *khaṭīb* Abū al-Qāsim, and other similar works". [95] By "the book of our shaykh" he means the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* of his teacher 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn Ḥubaysh. [96] As in al-Diyārbakrī's case, we may rely on the integrity of the author. Al-Kalā'ī 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-Kalā'ī, ed. Ghunaym, 8-9.
[93] Al-Kalā'ī, ed. Fāriq, Introduction, 10, and ed. Ghunaym, 9. Al-Zuhrī and al-Umawī will be discussed below.
[94] *Ibid.,* 3-8.
[95] Al-Kalā'ī, ed. Massé, 55; ed. 'Abd al-Wāḥid, 6; ed. Fāriq, Introduction, 8.
[96] Fāriq seems not to be aware of this book; he refers to it as "an unnamed work of his teacher Khaṭīb Abū l-Qāsim", see Fāriq, "A valuable manuscript", 164.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

for this is, apparently, that al-Kalā'ī 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-Kalā'ī 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-Kalā'ī quoted on the *ridda* from second-century sources is traceable to the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* of his teacher Ibn Ḥubaysh. Needless to say, al-Kalā'ī's references to even older authorities and eyewitnesses, which Fāriq interprets as indicating that he used "virgin sources", [97] were all derived from Ibn Ḥubaysh. From the total of 74 references made by al-Kalā'ī, there are only eight which I could not locate in the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt:* two passages from Wathīma 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 Isḥāq; two from Ibn 'Umar, and one from Ḍamra ibn Sa'īd. [98] That al-Kalā'ī 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-Kalā'ī also sometimes reproduced from the book of his teacher series of narratives, preserving the same arrangement of the material. [99] Obviously, had al-Kalā'ī 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-Kalā'ī drew heavily on Ibn Ḥubaysh, the part on the *ridda* in the *Iktifā'* is not merely a copy of the *Ghazawāt*. More often than not, al-Kalā'ī preserved neither the original arrangement nor the atomistic structure of his source, but rather integrated the isolated units recorded by Ibn Hubaysh into a continuous narrative. To achieve this continuity al-Kalā'ī 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.*

[98] Al-Kalā'ī, ed. Fāriq, 1:1, 58:6, 109ult, 145:4, 146:1. 122:1, 101:1, 83:1. See appendix B for a complete list of the references in both texts.

[99] E.g. al-Kalā'ī (Fāriq), 37:1-40:14=Ibn Ḥubaysh, 21:22-23:19 (=ed. I, 55-9).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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. [100] Examples of this process follow.

1. Ibn Ḥubaysh reproduced from the book of Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhrī an account of the beginning of the *ridda* (A1). [101] Immediately following is a variant account on the authority of two *tābi'ūn*, 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. [102] 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 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū 'Ubayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ and Sālim, *mawlā* 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) 'Umar'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. [103]

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-Zuhrī and a reproduction of part of A1: several Arab

[100] Cf. above.
[101] On al-Zuhrī see below.
[102] See Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, III, 185 and 223-7.
[103] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 8:22-10:2 (=ed. I, 21-24).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

tribes refused to pay the *zakāt,* adducing various pretexts. The Companions 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-Zuhrī's narrative. [104] 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-Zuhrī'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 Abū Bakr's speech, which apparently was originally taken from al-Zuhrī (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-Zuhrī based on the *Iktifā'* will therefore be misleading. [105]

2. Under the title of *fī ḥadīth ghayrihi,* "in the account of someone else", al-Kalā'ī opens a narrative with a sentence, taken out of its context, from a tradition originally transmitted by Isḥāq b. Yaḥyā. He continues the story uninterruptedly with a narrative from al-Wāqidī's book, omitting mention of the source. [106]

3. Ibn Ḥubaysh records two distinct traditions about two different arguments between the people of the tribe of Ṭayy and their leader, 'Adī ibn Ḥātim. One of these traditions is recorded on the authority of Ibn Isḥāq, the other on the authority of al-Sha'bī (d. 105/723). Al-Kalā'ī copies the reference to Ibn Isḥāq 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. [107]

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

[104] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 10:8-13 (=ed. I, 25; al-Kalā'ī, 3:6-4:3.
[105] See appendix C.
[106] Al-Kalā'ī, 143:8-145:3; Ibn Ḥubaysh, 73:8-9, 73:29-74:33 (=ed. I, 186, 187-9).
[107] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 14:19-15:12 (=ed. I, 36-8); al-Kalā'ī, 16:4-17:17. See Landau-Tasseron, "Ṭayy", 54-5.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

when he uses the formula *wa-fī kitāb,* "and in the book of...". [108] Contrary to the claims of Fāriq and Ghunaym, al-Kalā'ī never had at his disposal the *Kitāb al-ridda* of al-Wāqidī and the books of al-Umawī and al-Zuhrī, but rather copied the references to them from Ibn Ḥubaysh. As for the books of Wathīma and Sayf, it seems likely that al-Kalā'ī 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 *Ghazawāt* either.

2. Contrary to the assumption advanced by the editors of the *Iktifā'*, as well as by Muranyi, this book is not to be trusted for the reconstruction of al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda* or any other lost source. Admittedly, the *Iktifā'* contains even much more material from al-Wāqidī and al-Zuhrī 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 *Iktifā'* with the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* of Ibn Ḥubaysh.

Ibn Ḥubaysh

The scholar 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yūsuf ibn Ḥubaysh was an Andalusian of the sixth/twelfth century who gained his reputation mainly in the field of *ḥadīth.* [109] He acted as orator (*khaṭīb)* and judge to the Muwaḥḥid sultans 'Abd al-Mu'min (524-58/1130-63) and Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf (558-80/1163-84, and was commissioned by the latter to compose the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt wa-l-futūḥ,* a compilation of material on the Muslim conquests during the reign of the first three caliphs. [110] The book has a direct connection with the ideology and political program of the Muwaḥḥids. Abū Ya'qūb 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-Kalā'ī, 4:3.

[109] See Ibn Ḥubaysh, ed. Ghunaym, Introduction, 12-21; Dunlop, "The Spanish historian".

[110] Dunlop, 360; Ibn Ḥubaysh, 5. See also Huici Miranda, "Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb".

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

that he sought to have assembled the stories that illustrated the heroic Muslim past. [111]

Two manuscripts of the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* are known to exist, and parts of the work were already utilized by Caetani. [112] An incomplete edition in four volumes, based on both manuscripts, has been published by Aḥmad Ghunaym in Cairo. [113]

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-Wāqidī and other [books]" (*kitāb al-ridda li-Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Wāqidī wa-ghayrihi*), the *Ta'rīkh* of al-Ṭabarī, 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. [114] It is worthy of note that Ibn Ḥubaysh mentions both al-Ṭabarī and Sayf, because most of al-Ṭabarī'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-Wāqidī) was more reliable than the Iraqī school (in this case, Sayf). [115] 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 Muwaḥḥids also called upon traditionists to collect traditions about *jihād,* which were to be studied before setting out for war. See al-Marrākushī, *Al-Mu'jib,* 183. I thank Dr. Larry Conrad for this reference.

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

[113] See note 69 above.

[114] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 6:2-5 (=ed. I, 12).

[115] Caetani, *Annali,* II, 550, n.º 70. On the problematic nature of Sayf's traditions, see Noth, "Charakter"; Landau-Tasseron, "Sayf".

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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-Ṭabarī) draw a picture of the *ridda* which is very different from that offered in the other sources.

Not only Sayf, but also al-Ṭabarī 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-Ṭabarī's *Ta'rīkh*. [116] Thus Ibn Ḥubaysh's sources on the *ridda* were "the *Kitāb al-ridda* of al-Wāqidī and others [books]", which remain unspecified. The references in the text of the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* do not correspond to the list of sources given in the introduction, except when the reference is to al-Wāqidī. As opposed to the al-Kalā'ī'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. [117] 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-fī ḥadīth,* "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'bī, 'Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr b. Ḥazm (d. 130/747), al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), Abū 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. [118] Indeed, Ibn Ḥubaysh explic-

[116] See below.

[117] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 6:2-3 (=ed. I, 12); *wa-l-mu'tamad fī jam' hādhā al-kitāb 'alā kitāb al-ridda li-Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Wāqidī wa-ghayrihi wa-'alā Kitāb al-ta'rīkh li-Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī wa-Kitāb al-ridda wa-l-futūḥ li-Sayf ibn 'Umar al-Usayyidī wa-l-kitāb al-mawsūm bi-Futūḥ al-Shām.* The phrase *wa-ghayrihi* must refer to books other than those listed, because of the immediate repetition of the preposition *wa-'alā.*

[118] E.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, 47:5-6 (=ed. I, 122). The sequence begins with al-Wāqidī at 42:10 (=ed. I, 110). The phrase *ḥaddathanī Abū Ma'shar,* "I was told by Abū Ma'shar",

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

itly cites Abū Ma'shar from the book of al-Dūlābī, [119] and there is one passage from (*'an)* al-Sha'bī that was evidently excerpted from the book of Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī. [120]

The second category of references is the (less numerous) quotations which Ibn Ḥubaysh introduces with the words *wa-fī 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-fī 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-fī kitāb* apparently indicates the books that served as his direct sources. These are the following:

1. the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim (d. 261/875)
2. the *Kitāb al-ta'rīkh* of Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī (d. 320/932)
3. the *Maghāzī* of Ibn Isḥāq
4. a book by Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī (d. 194/809)
5. a book by Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhrī.

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.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

tled *Futūḥ al-Shām)*. These five books are not cited in al-Ṭabarī, they are not likely to have been cited in any version of the *Futūḥ 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'ī 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-fī kitāb* seems to be genuine. The fact that he did not hesitate to explicitly cite the second century authors, al-Sha'bī 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*. [121] 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*. [122]

Al-Dūlābī

Like Muslim, Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī 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-Dūlābī, and at the end of the quotation there is a mark and a comment that the original has been abridged. [123] Al-Dūlābī was a *muḥaddith* and historian who lived

[121] *Ibid.*, 7:7 (=ed. I, 17).
[122] See Kister, *"illā bi-ḥaqqihi"*.
[123] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 62:16-63:19 (=ed. I, 160-3). This is the only time that Ibn Ḥubaysh indicates an abridgement.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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-ṭāhira al-muṭahhara*. [124] 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. [125] There is, however, a possibility that Ibn Ḥubaysh quoted from another book of al-Dūlābī, 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-Dūlābī 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'*. [126] Al-Dūlābī was also known to the Egyptian Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Kindī (d. 350/961), author of the *Kitāb al-wulāt wa-kitāb al-quḍāt.* Al-Kindī directly transmitted from al-Dūlābī two anecdotes, one of which contains historical information. [127] Much more evidence is needed before deciding whether or not al-Dūlābī 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. [128]

Ibn Isḥāq and al-Umawī

Ibn Isḥāq'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-Ishbīlī, 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, *Wulāt,* 74, 318.

[128] According to al-'Umarī, *Dirāsāt,* 153, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī cites a *Ta'rīkh al-khulafā'* by al-Dūlābī. Unfortunately, al-'Umarī gives no details and no reference.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

quotation from Ibn Isḥāq. [129] The account quoted deals with the career of the Ṭā'ī leader 'Adī b. Ḥātim, who, having been appointed tax collector by Muḥammad, remained faithful to Islam when the *ridda* broke out and stood up against those of his people who wanted to secede. [130] The passage is not to be found in either Ibn Hishām or al-Ṭabarī (who derived many accounts from Ibn Isḥāq). Another quotation from Ibn Isḥāq depicts the scene of the battle that took place between the Muslim forces and the coalition of rebels headed by the false prophet Ṭulayḥa (the battle of Buzākha, in the year 11/632). [131] 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 *Ta'rīkh.* 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 Isḥāq is recorded in the *Ta'rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk.* [132] 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 Hubaysh'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-Kalā'ī 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 Isḥāq). 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 Isḥāq's description of the battle of Buzākha is placed after a series of traditions from Ibn al-Kalbī. [133] In the text of Ibn Ḥubaysh this same account (i.e. Ibn Isḥāq's, about Buzākha) is placed after two short traditions from al-Kalbī, introduced by the words *wa-fī ḥadīth....* [134] Unfortu-

[129] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 14:19-15:8 (=ed. I, 36-8).
[130] See Landau-Tasseron, "Ṭayy", 53-6.
[131] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 20:15-25 (=ed. I, 52-3).
[132] III, 256-7.
[133] *Ibid.,* III, 254-5; the sequence has seven traditions from Ibn al-Kalbī, then the one from Ibn Isḥāq.
[134] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 20:7-15 (=ed. I, 52). Ibn Ḥubaysh seldom uses the formula *wa-fī ḥadīth,* and when he does, the quotations are apparently second-hand, e.g. 28:18, 70:28, 72:10, 18, 73:5 (=ed. I, 73, 181, 184, 185, 186).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

nately these two traditions are not to be found in al-Ṭabarī, so it cannot be proven by sequential evidence that Ibn Ḥubaysh drew Ibn Isḥāq's account from al-Ṭabarī's *Ta'rīkh.* Yet this partial parallelism hardly strikes one as accidental, particularly in view of the fact that nowhere else does Ibn Ḥubaysh cite al-Kalbī or his son. Perhaps Ibn Ḥubaysh had at his disposal a version of al-Ṭabarī that contained the two al-Kalbī traditions, together with the Ibn al-Kalbī series. [135]

Three other passages from Ibn Isḥāq occur in Ibn Ḥubaysh's text as second-hand quotations, excerpted from the book of Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Umawī. [136] In addition, two short statements are cited from al-Umawī which are not ascribed to Ibn Isḥāq. [137] All these passages from al-Umawī are immediately followed by quotations from other books (al- Wāqidī, al-Zuhrī), so that there is no difficulty in identifying the closing of the quotations. Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd 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-Ṭabarī, and Ibn Ḥajar. Sezgin's contention (following Fāriq) that this *Kitāb al-maghāzī* was also used by al-Kalā'ī is not correct. As has been shown above, al-Kalā'ī 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 Isḥāq, 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 *Maghazī* in the recension of (*riwāyat*) al-Umawī", and, "the *Maghāzī* of Ibn Isḥāq in the recensions of Ibn

[135] The series from Ibn al-Kalbī mentioned above do not go back to al-Kalbī, but to other authorities.

[136] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 21:24, 28:18, 37:16 (=ed. I, 53, 73, 97).

[137] *Ibid.,* 37:7, 38:20 (=ed. I, 96, 100).

[138] Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam,* XIII, 199; *GAS,* I, 293.

[139] E.g. al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh,* III, 162, 194.

[140] *Al-Umawī fī maghāzīhi.* Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba,* III, 469 (s.v. Mawhib al-Nawfalī), III, 649 (s.v. Yuḥannas ibn Wabara).

[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. *Iṣāba,* II, 266 (s.v. 'Abbād b. Kathīr, III, 188 (s.v. Ghunaym b. Zuhayr).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

Hishām and al-Umawī". [142] These references suggest that al-Umawī 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 Isḥāq's *Maghāzī*. [143] Naturally, al-Umawī could have been both an author and a transmitter, but in that case a distinction should be made between the *Maghāzī* which is his own compilation and the book of the same title which is a recension of Ibn Isḥāq's work. [144] If he was not an author but merely a transmitter of Ibn Isḥāq's *Maghāzī,* 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-Umawī on the authority of Ibn Isḥāq may have been taken from Ibn Isḥāq's *Maghazī,* or from his *Kitāb al-khulafā'*. [146] Al-Umawī was sometimes quoted on the *ridda* also by Ibn Ḥajar, which led Caetani to conclude that al-Umawī 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-Umawī,* "the book of al-Umawī".

Al-Zuhrī

Ibn Ḥubaysh refers many times to a book by Ya'qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Zuhrī for which he specifies no title. This al-Zuhrī, a descendant of the Companion 'Abd al-Raḥmān 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. Ḥimān); III, 390 (s.v. Makhraba b. 'Adī). Cf. III, 192 (s.v. Ghaylan b. 'Amr): "...al-Umawī also metioned him in the *Maghāzī* of Yūnus ibn Bukayr." Yūnus himself (d. 199/815) was a transmitter *(rāwī)* of Ibn Isḥāq's *Maghāzī*, so it is not certain which work Ibn Ḥajar is quoting here.

[143] Fück, *Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq,* 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-Umawī in later sources.

[145] See above.

[146] Note that the passage quoted from Ibn Isḥāq's *Maghāzī* above, also deals with the *ridda.* On the *Kitāb al-khulafā'* see Abbott, *Studies,* I, 80-99.

[147] E.g. Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba,* I, 374 (s.v. Ḥujayl b. Qudāma); II, 50 (s.v. Sa'īd b. 'Adī); Caetani, *Annali,* II, 550, n.º 70. Hoenerbach, *Wathīma,* 220, shares Caetani's conclusion.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

opinions of him are generally low, although some authorities among the *muḥaddithūn* considered him to be reliable. [148] *Ḥadīth*s transmitted by him are sparse and hard to come by. [149] Judging by the material ascribed to him in the *Kitāb al-aghānī,* little as it is, al-Zuhrī was not only a *muḥaddith* but also transmitted anecdotes. Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb and al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, who worked in the field which lies between history and historical gossip, transmitted from him directly. [150] The material transmitted from him by Ibn Ḥubaysh comprises accounts of the *ridda* in various parts of Arabia, and has little, if anything, to do with *ḥadīth* from and about the Prophet. The quotations occur in various types of combinations, which are described below:

1. A narrative unit from the book of al-Zuhrī (a), followed by a unit from another book (b), for example: (a) *wa-fī kitāb al-Zuhrī*....(b) *wa-qāla/'an al-Wāqidī* .... [151] The closing points of the quotations can be clearly identified.

2. A narrative unit from al-Zuhrī (a), followed by another (b), e.g. (a) *wa-fī kitāb al-Zuhrī*...(b) *wa-fīhi*.... [152] Unit (b) may be followed by yet another unit from al-Zuhrī, or by a quotation from another book, or by material from older sources, such as eye-witnesses. In this last case the closing of the quotation is not clear (see nº 3. below). The impression gained from this structure is that Ibn Ḥubaysh quoted from different places in al-Zuhrī's book. In order to indicate that he did not follow the original arrangement of al-Zuhrī's narratives, he inserted the phrase *wa-fīhi,* "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 Abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ,* IV.2, 214-5; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb,* XI, 396-7; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rīkh,* XIV, 269-71; al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān,* III, 325.

[149] For a *ḥadīth* on the merits of a certain territory in Medina see al-Ḥarbī, *Manāsik,* 404; I owe this reference to Prof. Amikam Elad. See also al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh,* II, 156-7, a tradition about the light that shone when the Prophet was born; al-Dūlābī, *Kunā,* 10, has some information from this Zuhrī.

[150] Al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī,* VIII, 122; XVI, 196; XVII, 325; XXI, 346. See also XX, 346, and al-Jāsir, *Mu'allafāt,* 99.

[151] E.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, 15:19-21, 21:20-24, 22:14-23:1, 34:12-25, 38:21-23 (=ed. I, 39, 55, 57-8, 89-90, 100). The *qāla* and *'an* in these cases stand for *fī kitāb* (except 21:24), see above.

[152] E.g. *ibid.,* 26:4-6, 37:22-25 (=ed. I, 66, 98).

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

neither conventional nor common, as opposed to the use of the verb *qāla* "he said". Had Ibn Ḥubaysh copied successive accounts from al-Zuhrī, 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-Zuhrī's book 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-Zuhrī (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-Zuhrī....*(b) *wa-'an Abī Sa'īd al-Khudrī...*(c) *wa-'an Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyab...*(d) *wa-'an Mūsā ibn Muḥammad 'an abīhi...*(e) *wa-'an Zayd ibn Ṭalḥa ....*(f) *wa-qāla Sālim ibn 'Abdallāh ibn 'Umar...*(g) *wa-fī Kitāb al-ta'rīkh li-Abī Bishr al-Dūlābī....* [153] Ibn Ḥubaysh's distinctive terminology is presumably at work here. [154] It appears that he quotes from al-Zuhrī's book passages that consist of several successive units, indicating his immediate source (al-Zuhrī) only at the beginning of the first one. The units (a)-(f), in other words, constitute one quotation from al-Zuhrī, 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-Zuhrī) *bi-sanadihi 'an 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakra...*(b) *wa-'an 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakra* (c) *wa-fī ḥadīth ākhar qāla 'an 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakra...* [155] In cases where the units are ascribed to various authorities, it is possible that part of the sequence was taken not from al-Zuhrī'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-Zuhrī in the list of sources used by al-Kalā'ī, states that al-Zuhrī complied a book on the *maghāzī,* and refers the reader to Ibn Ḥajar's *Tahdhīb* and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's *Ta'rīkh Baghdād.* [156] As shown above, al-Kalā'ī never used al-Zuhrī's book directly. Ibn Ḥajar and al-Khaṭīb

[153] *Ibid.,* 61:8-62:16 (=ed. I, 157-60).

[154] I.e. *'an* or *qāla* as opposed to *fī kitāb,* although *qāla* is occasionally used to refer to a book, see above.

[155] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 71:16-72:8 (=ed. I, 182-4).

[156] Al-Kalā'ī, *Ta'rīkh al-ridda,* ed. Fāriq, introduction, 10.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

al-Baghdādī in fact mention no book by al-Zuhrī, nor do other bio-bibliogaphical works, either classical or modern. [157] Nevertheless, the extensive quotations preserved by Ibn Ḥubaysh, and his reference to "al-Zuhrī's book", probably reflect a genuine second-century text. Since Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī was neither widely known nor highly appreciated the possibility of false ascription does not seem likely.

Al-Wāqidī

There are a few indications that Ibn Ḥubaysh took the *Kitāb al-ridda* of al-Wāqidī 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 *Kitāb al-ghazawāt.* Second, al-Wāqidī is mentioned in the introductory list of sources, whereas al-Zuhrī, who is also quoted, is not. Third, when Ibn Ḥubaysh finds that al-Wāqidī and al-Zuhrī relate similar accounts of the same event and so decides to cite only one of the two, it is the material of al-Wāqidī, not al-Zuhrī, that he chooses to use.The amount of the material which Ibn Ḥubaysh quotes from al-Wāqidī is not immediately detectable, because of the patterns of citation that he uses. These are as follows:

1. A narrative unit from al-Wāqidī (a), followed by a quotation from another book (b). [158] This structure, in which the closing of the quotation is clear, is rare, because the quotations from al-Wāqidī usually consist of more than one narrative unit.

2. Two or more successive narrative units from al-Wāqidī. Occasionally these are introduced with the formulae (a) *wa-fī kitāb al-Wāqidī...*(b) *wa-fīhi...* [159] 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 Ḥubaysh uses the formula *qāla* (in place of *fī kitāb*), for example: (a) *qāla al-Wāqidī qālū* (a long composite story follows) (b) *qāla al-Wāqidī wa-ḥuddith-*

[157] Al-Zuhrī is also absent from al-Baghdādī's list of sources, prepared by al-'Umarī, in his *Dirāsāt,* 145-219.

[158] E.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, 28:13-18 (=ed. I, 72-73).

[159] E.g. *ibid.,* 20:25-27 (=ed. I, 53). See also above.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

tu 'an rajul... [160] 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-Wāqidī's original arrangement: (a) *wa-'an al-Wāqidī...*(b) *wa-fī kitāb al-Wāqidī...*(c) *wa-qāla al-Wāqidī...*(d) *qāla al-Wāqidī...* [161] Considering the content of the units, (c) could have well succeeded (b) in the original arrangement (i.e. al-Wāqidī'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-Wāqidī appear is a long series of narrative units in which only the first is explicitly ascribed to al-Wāqidī, 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-fī kitāb*) begins. This structure obfuscates the extent to which Ibn Ḥubaysh drew upon al-Wāqidī; 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-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda.* There is, for instance, the sequence that consists of four narrative units ascribed to the following authorities: al-Wāqidī (a), al-Kalbī (b), al-Kalbī (c), Ibn Isḥāq (d). [162] After (d) is recorded another unit from al-Wāqidī's book (*wa-fī kitāb al-Wāqidī).* Technically, it seems that accounts (b), (c), and (d) are the continuation of the quotation from al-Wāqidī, but to the best of my knowledge, al-Wāqidī never quotes Ibn Isḥāq, the authority cited in

[160] *Ibid.,* 18:12-20:1 (=ed. I, 46-51)
[161] *Ibid.,* 10:2-11:14 (=ed. I, 24-7).
[162] *Ibid.,* 20:1-25 (=ed. I, 51-3): *qāla al-Wāqidī...wa-min ḥadīth Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī...qāla al-Kalbī...wa-'an Ibn Isḥāq...*

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

(d). Most probably Ibn Ḥubaysh excerpted Ibn Isḥāq's account from al-Ṭabarī, omitting mention of the latter's name. As for the two passages from al-Kalbī, they could have originated either in al-Wāqidī's or al-Ṭabarī's text. [163] Al-Wāqidī, however, is not known to have quoted al-Kalbī often, if at all. [164] It thus appears that in this particular series, only the first account was copied from al-Wāqidī.

Series may be very long indeed, so that the fact (or mere possibility) that they were derived from al-Wāqidī in their entirety may be doubted. For instance, an account on the authority of al-Waqidī 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-Wāqidī said: I mentioned [this story] to 'Abdallāh ibn Ja'far, and he said...'". [165] This means that the 29th unit was taken from al-Wāqidī. In addition, units 23-27, recorded on the authority of Maḥmūd ibn Labīd, Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, 'Umar b. Muḥammad, Asmā' bint Abī Bakr, and Nāfi', are quoted from al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda* in yet another source. [166] As for units 1-26, the authorities to whom they are ascribed are mostly persons who are quoted by al-Wāqidī several times, such as Ḍamra b. Sa'īd, Maḥmūd b. Labīd, among others. [167] Therefore, it seems fairly safe to conclude that the whole series of 30 items was excerpted from al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda.* Apparently, Ibn Ḥubaysh derived whole series from al-Wāqidī, but mentioned his name only at the beginning in order to avoid repetition.

Not much has hitherto been known about al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-ridda* because it is not widely quoted. The Bankipore manuscript to which Sezgin refers as al-Wāqidī's *Ridda* has proved to be a part of Ibn A'tham's *Kitāb al-futūḥ.* [168] The long passages excerpted by Ibn

[163] See above.

[164] There is an al-Kalbī cited once in al-Wāqidī's *Kitāb al-maghāzī* (ed. Jones, II, 864:2), but it canot be proven that Muḥamad ibn al-Sā'ib is meant.

[165] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 49:24-58:20 (= ed. I, 129-51).

[166] *Kitāb takhrīj aḥādīth al-hidāya* (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).

[168] Muranyi, "Ein nueur Bericht", 236-8.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

Ḥubaysh from al-Wāqidī 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-Wāqidī 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. [169] There are methodological similarities as well. Like al-Wāqidī, al-Zuhrī recorded accounts which go back to (alleged) eye witnesses and tribal sources. [170] He apparently incorporated lists in his narrative (although there is only one instance recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh), as al-Wāqidī quite frequently did in his *Maghāzī*. [171] 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. Muḥammad b. 'Īsā 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:...". [172] This is reminiscent of al-Wāqidī's words in his introduction to the *Kitāb al-maghāzī*. [173] Originating in the same period and area as al-Wāqidī'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-

[169] E.g Ibn Ḥubaysh, 26:13, 37:22, 76:19 (=ed. I, 67, 98, 194).
[170] E.g. *ibid.,* 26:8, 78:14, 80:14 (=ed. I, 67, 199, 203ult).
[171] *Ibid.,* 38:21 (ed. I, 100), cf. al-Wāqidī, *Maghāzī,* I, 138, 145-72, etc.
[172] Ibn Ḥubaysh, 7:27-8:2 (=ed. I, 19).
[173] Al-Wāqidī, *Maghāzī,* I, 1-2. On collective *isnāds* and the consequences of the method see Landau-Tasseron, "Processes of redaction".

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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 *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* results, as in al-Diyārbakrī's case, not from the piecing together of original disparate units, but from the breaking up of former continuous narratives, mainly those of al-Wāqidī and al-Zuhrī. But as it happens, it is these narratives to which we seek access. It is possible, but useless, to reconstruct part of the *Kitāb al-iktifā'* from the quotations in the *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs*. It is possible and useful to reconstruct parts of the lost works of al-Wāqidī and al-Zuhrī from the *Kitāb al-ghazawāt* 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. [174] 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-Diyārbakrī and al-Kalā'ī (page:line)

The purpose of this collation is to show how al-Diyārbakrī used al-Kalā'ī'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-Diyārbakrī (these are not numerous anyway), but rather have focused on his additions.

[174] Cf. Leder, "Features", 72-96.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

Al-Diyābakrī (vol. II)	Al-Kalā'ī
201:1-5	1:1-5
201:5-26	—
201:26-34	2:10-4:3
201:35-202:1	—
202:1-204:8 (a sentence and a few verses are omitted)	4:3-17:17
204:8	—
204:8-205:9	17:18-23:2
205:9-10	—
205:10-208:3 (with a few omossion and a paraphrase of a letter)	24:1-41:9
208:3-7	—
208:7-209:17 (with omissions and abridgements)	42:1-54:4
209:17-18	—
209:18-20	54:5-7
209:20-21	—
209:21-24 (an editorial remark added by al-Kalā'ī, 54:7-9)	54:9-14
209:24-26	—
209:26-212:18 (with a few omissions, and variations, and mistakes)	63:14-79:8 [175]
212:18-20	—
212:21-27	79:8-16
212:27-213:1	—
213:1-14	122:11-124:6
213:14-216:29 (with an omission, variations, addition of a gloss, and of lines which are lacking in Fāriq's edition of Kal'a'ī; al-Diyārbakrī 214:27-216:8-9)	80:1-95:5
216:29-34	—
216:34-220:4 (with several omissions)	95:5-124:9
220:4-221:14	—
221:4-13 (al-Diyābkrī quotes the *Iktifā'* but the passage in not in Fāriq's edition)	?
221:14-23	—
221:23-33	142:4-9

Appendix B
Collation of References in al-Kalā'ī and Ibn Ḥubaysh
(The numbers in parentheses refer to Ghunaym' edition)

Al-Kalā'ī		Ibn Ḥubaysh
1:1	Ibn Isḥāq	—
2:10	al-Zuhrī	8:22 (I, 21)
4:3	al-Wāqidī	10:6 (I, 24)

[175] The material in al-Kalā'ī 55-63 was copied by al-Diyārbakrī in another place, 155-9.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

8:2	Abū Hurayra	11:18 (I, 28)
8:3	Abū Marzūq	11:19 (I, 28), Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb *'an* Abū Marzūq
16:4	Ibn Isḥāq (abridged)	14:19 (I,36) Ibn Isḥāq in his *Maghāzī*
20:4	Sabra al-Juhanī	15:24 (I,39) apparently from al-Wāqidī's *Ridda*
24:1	Ḥanẓala b. 'Alī	16:13 (I,41) al-Wāqidī, with an *isnād* to Ḥanẓala
24:5	Nāfi' b. Jubayr	16:17 (I, 41)
29:6	'Urwa b. al-Zubayr	17:22 (I, 44) al-Wāqidī in his *isnād* quoting 'Urwa
34:12	al-Kalbī	20:10 (I, 52) al-Kalbī, with an *isnād*
35:1	al-Wāqidī	20:25 (I, 53)
35:10	Ibn Isḥāq	20:15 (I, 52)
37:1	Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī	21:21 (I, 55)
37:5	Ibn Isḥāq	21:24 (I, 55) the account is here quoted from Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd, no mention of Ibn Isḥāq; see 72-75 above
38:6	al-Wāqidī	21:29 (I, 55pu)
39:8	[Ya'qūb] al-Zuhrī	22:14 (I,57)
41:1	al-Wāqidī	23:6 (I, 58)
42:8	al-Wāqidī	23:26 (I, 60)
49:1	Yazīd b. Sharīk	27:11 (I, 70) apparently quoted from al-Wāqidī
54:8	Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī, al-Wāqidī	29:20 (I, 75)
56:1	Rāfi' b. Khudayj	30:10 (I, 78) al-Wāqidī in his *isnād* from Rāfi'
56:5	Ibn 'Abbās	30:12 (I, 78) apparently quoted from al-Wāqidī
57:4	Ibn 'Abbās*'an* Abū Hurayra	30:18-19 (I, 79)
58:6	Ibn Isḥāq	—
59:2	Rāfi' b. Khudayj	31:2 (I, 80)
64:6	Sharīk al-Fazārī	35:20 (I, 92)
71:2	al-Wāqidī	36:10 (I, 94) al-Wāqidī from Hishām b. Sa'd from al-Rujayl b. Iyās....
75:3	al-Umawī	38:20 (I, 100)
78:11	'Ikrima	40:1 (I, 103) apparently from al-Wāqidī
78:15	al-Wāqidī	42:10 (I, 110)
80:4	Waḥshī	40:7 (I, 104)
81:1	Ibn 'Umar	40:15 (I, 105)
81:4	Sharīk al-Fazārī	40:17 (I, 105) Yazīd b. Sharīk from his father
81:9	Rafi' b. Khudayj	43:8 (I, 112) 'Abdallāh b. Rāfi' b. Khudayj from his father

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

83:1	Ḍamra b. Sa'īd	—
86:7	Abū Khaythama	45:4 (I, 117) Ḍamra b. Sa'īd *'an* Abū Khaythama
88:1	Wāqid b. 'Amr	46:21 (I, 121) 'Uqba b. Abī Jasra *'an* Wāqid
88:15	Wāqid b. 'Amr	47:3-4 (I, 122)
89:1	Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī	50:10 (I, 130)
90:13	'Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr b. Ḥazm	49:24 (I, 129) al-Wāqidī, *'an* 'Abd al-Raḥman b. Muḥammad b. Ḥazm, *'an* 'Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr b. Ḥazm
91:8	Khalid b. al-Walīd	47:19 (I, 124)
93:12	Ḍamra b. Sa'īd	45:24 (I, 119)
94:7	al-Ḥārith b. Fuḍayl	50:21 (I, 131)
95:1	Waḥshī	53:28 (I, 139) 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Adī quoting Waḥshī
98:13	Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥibān	52:10 (I, 136)
101:1	Ibn 'Umar	—
103:3	Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī	51:10 (I, 133)
104:1	Muḥammad b. Labīd	54:19 (I, 141)
109:14	Wathīma	—
114:5	Zayd b. Aslam - his father	58:26 (I, 152)
115:14	al-Wāqidī	60:1 (I, 154)
116:9	Zayd b. Aslam	60:15 (I, 155) Zayd b. Aslam – his father
118:6	Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī (abridged)	61:8 (I, 157) quoted from al-Zuhrī's book, with a reference to an *isnād*
120:12	Sālim b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Umar	62:13 (I, 159)
121:1	Zayd b. Ṭalḥa	62:11 (I, 159)
121:3	Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī	62:6 (I, 159)
122:2	Ibn 'Umar	—
123:8	al-Wāqidī	58:20 (I, 151)
124:7	Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī	63:19 (I, 163)
125:1	al-Wāqidī	65:1 (I, 167) al-Wāqidī, from 'Abdallah b. al-Ḥārith from his father, from Sufyān b. Abī al-'Awjā'
130:11	Sufyān b. Abī al-'Awjā'	68:10 (I, 174)
134:1	Hishām b. 'Urwa – his father	69:12 (I,177) taken from al-Wāqidī, who quotes 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī al-Zinād – Hishām b. 'Urwa – his father
135:1	Ya'qūb al-Zuhrī - Isḥāq b. Yaḥyā- his uncle 'Īsā b. Ṭalḥa	70:2 (I, 179)
136:1	al-Ḥasan b. Abī al-Ḥasan	70:10 (I, 179)
140:11	Isḥāq b. Yaḥyā b. Ṭalḥa	72:10 (I, 184)

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

141:9	Ibn Isḥāq	72:18 (I, 185) Isḥāq b. Yaḥyā; since the account is identical, the "Ibn Isḥāq" in al-Kalā'ī may be a mistake
142:ult	Ibrāhīm b. Abī Ḥabība	73:1 (I, 186)
145:4	Wathīma	—
146:1	Sayf (as quoted by Dāraquṭnī)	—
150:7	'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz	76:14 (I, 194)
150:9	'Urwa	76:20 (I, 194) taken from the book of al-Zuhrī who quotes 'Urwa
154:1	al-Sha'bī	78:11 (I, 198)
168:16	al-Wāqidī	86:5 (I, 216)

Appendix C
Analysis of One Reshaped Account

In the following table I trace al-Kalā'ī'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.

Al-Kalā'ī	Ibn Ḥubaysh
2:10-3:6 al-Zuhrī	8:22-9:1 (I, 21-22) al-Zuhrī (A1)
3:6-4:3 (no source mentioned)	10:8-13 (I, 25) al-Wāqidī, (B2b); it is a continuation of (B2a) and al-Wāqidī's name is not repeated.
4:3-5 al-Wāqidī	10:6-8 (I, 24) al-Wāqidī (B2a)
4:6-5:12 no source mentioned	9:13-28 (I, 23-34) Yaḥyā b. 'Abdallāh b. Abī Qatāda and Usāma b. Zayd b. Aslam – his father (A2)
5:12-15 no source mentioned	10:3-6 (I, 24) al-Wāqidī (B1)
5:15	9:29 (I, 24) part of (A2)

Bibliography

ABBOTT, Nabia, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri.* Chicago, 1957-72.

ABŪ YA'LĀ AL-MAWṢILI, *Musnad.* Ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad. Damascus, 1404-1409/ 1984-88.

AHLWARDT, Wilhelm, *Verzeichnis arabischer Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin.* Berlin, 1887-99.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

AḤMAD, Imtiyāz, *Dalā'il al-tawthīq al-mubakkar li-l-sunna wa-l-ḥadīth.* Trans. 'Abd al-Muṭī' Amīn Qal'ajī. Karachi, 1990.

'ALI, Jawād, "Mawārid ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī". *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Irāqī* 1 (1950), 143-231, 2 (1951), 135-90, 3 (1954), 16-56, 8 (1961), 425-36.

ATHAMINA, Khalil, "The sources of Balādhurī's *Ansāb al-ashrāf, JSAI* 5 (1984), 237-62.

'AṬWĀN, Ḥusayn, *Al-riwāya al-ta'rīkhiyya fī bilād al-Shām fī al-'aṣr al-umawī.* Beirut, 1986.

AL-A'ẒAMI, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, *Maghāzī rasūl allāh li-'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr bi-riwāyat Abī al-Aswad 'anhu (al-nuskha al-mustakhraja).* Riyadh, 1401/1981.

BELLAMY, James, "Sources of Ibn Abī al-Dunyā's *Kitāb maqtal amīr al-mu'minīn 'Alī", JAOS* 104 (1984), 3-19.

BREYDY, Michel, *Études sur Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq et ses sources,* Leuven, 1983.

CAETANI, Leone, *Annali dell'Islam.* Milan, 1905-26.

CODERA, Francisco, and RIBERA TARRAGÓ, Julián, eds., *Index librorum de diversis scientiarum ordinaribus quo a magistris didicit Abū Bequer Ben Khair.* Saragossa, 1894-5.

CONRAD, L. A., "Al-Azdī's history of the Arab conquests in Bilād al-Shām: some historiographical observations", in M.A. Bakhit and I. Abbas (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Symposium on the History of Bilād al-Shām during the Early Islamic Period up to 40 A.H./640 A. D.,* Amman, 1987, I, 28-62.

IDEM, "The conquest of Arwād: a source-critical study in the historiography of the early medieval Near East", in Averil Cameron and Lawrence I. Conrad (eds.). *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East,* I: *Problems in the Literary Source Material.* Princeton, 1992, 317-401.

AL-DHAHABI, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Mīzān al-i'tidāl fī naqd al-rijāl.* Cairo, 1325.

AL-DIYĀRBAKRI, Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad, *Ta'rīkh al-khamīs fī aḥwāl anfas nafīs.* Cairo, 1283.

DOZY, R. P. A., et al., *Catalogus codicum orientalium Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno Batavae.* Leiden, 1851-77.

AL-DŪLĀBI, Abū Bishr, *Al-kunā wa-l-asmā'.* Hyderabad, 1322.

DUNLOP, D. M., "The Spanish historian Ibn Ḥubaysh", *JRAS* 1941, 359-62.

AL-DŪRI, 'Abd al-'Azīz, *Baḥth fī nash'at 'ilm al-ta'rīkh 'inda al-'arab,* Beirut, 1960.

FĀRIQ, Khūrshīd Aḥmad, "A valuable historical manuscript of Arabic – *Al-iktifā", Islamic Culture* 33 (1959), 161-68.

FARUQI, Nisar Ahmed, *Early Muslim Historiography.* Delhi, 1979.

FLEISCHHAMMER, Manfred, "Quellenuntersuchungen zum *Kitāb al-aghānī".* Habilitationsschrift Universität Halle, 1965.

FÜCK, Johann, *Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq. Literarhistorische Untersuchungen*, Frankfurt am Main, 1925.

GOLDZIHER, Ignaz, *Muslim Studies.* Ed. and trans. S. M. Stern and C. R. Barber. London, 1967-71.

GÜNTHER, Sebastian, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyīn des Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī (gest. 356/967).* Zurich and New York, 1991.

AL-ḤĀKIM AL-NAYSĀBŪRI, *Al-madkhal fī 'ilm al-ḥadīth.* Ed. and trans. James Robson. London, 1953.

AL-ḤARBI, Ibrāhīm, *Kitāb al-manāsik wa-amākin al-ḥajj wa-ma'ālim al-jazīra.* Ed. Ḥamad al-Jāsir. Riyadh, 1389/1969.

HEER, Justus F., *Die historischen und geographischen Quellen in Yāqūts geographischem Wörterbuch,* Strassburg, 1898.

DEN HEIJER, Johannes, *Mawhūb ibn Manṣūr ibn Mufarrij et l'historiographie copto-arabe: étude sur la composition de l'Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie,* Louvain, 1989.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

HINDS, Martin, "Sayf b. Umar's sources on Arabia", in his *Studies in Early Islamic History*, ed. J. Bacharach, L. I. Conrad and P. Crone, Princeton, 1996.

HOENERBACH, Wilhelm, *Wathīma's Kitāb ar-Ridda aws Ibn Ḥağars Iṣāba,* Mainz 1951.

HOROVITZ, Josef, *The Earliest Biographies of the Prophet and their Authors,* ed. by L. I. Conrad, Princeton, 2002.

HUICI MIRANDA, Ambrosio, "Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb", *EI*^{2}, I, Leiden 1960, 160b-162a.

IBN ABĪ ḤĀTIM AL-RĀZĪ, *Kitāb al-jarḥ wa-l-ta'dīl.* Hyderabad, 1360-73/1941-53.

IBN ḤAJAR AL-'ASQALĀNĪ, *Al-iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba.* Cairo, 1328.

IDEM.,Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb. Hyderabad, 1325-27.

IBN HISHĀM, 'Abd al-Malik. *Al-sīra al-nabawiyya.* Ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and 'Abd al-Ḥafīẓ Shalabī. Cairo, 1355/1936.

IBN ḤUBAYSH, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥamad. *Kitāb al-ghazawāt wa-l-futūḥ.* Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden Ms. Warner 343. the same. Ed. Aḥmad Ghunaym. Cairo, 1404/1983.

IBN KHAYR, See under Codera.

IBN AL-NADĪM, *Kitāb al-fihrist.* Ed. Gustav Flügel. Leipzig, 1871-72.

IBN SA'D., *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr.* Ed. Eduard Sachau. Leiden, 1904-40.

IBN AL-ṢALĀḤ, 'Uthmān b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, *'Ulūm al-ḥadīth.* Ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh. Aleppo, 1350/1931.

IBRĀHĪM, Khalīl, "'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr", *Al-Mawrid* 5/4 (1397/1976), 76-80.

AL-IṢFAHĀNĪ, Abū al-Faraj, *Kitāb al-aghānī.* Cairo, 1345-94/1927-1974.

AL-JĀSIR, Ḥamad, "Mu'allafāt fī ta'rīkh al-Madīna", *Majallat al-'Arab* 4, 1, (1969-70), 97-101.

KAḤḤĀLA, 'Umar Riḍā, *Mu'jam al-mu'allifīn.* Damascus, 1376-80/1957-61.

AL-KALĀ'I, Sulaymān b. Mūsā, *Al-iktifā' bi-maghāzī al-muṣṭafā wa-l-thalāthat al-khulafā'.* Ed. Henri Massé. Algiers, 1931. the same, ed. Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Wāḥid. Cairo, 1387/1968.

IDEM, Ta'rīkh al-ridda. Ed. Khūrshīd Aḥmad Fāriq. Delhi, 1970.

IDEM, Al-khilāfa al-rāshida wa-l-buṭūla al-khālida. Ed. Aḥmad Ghunaym. Cairo, 1981.

KHALIDI, Tarif, *Islamic Historiography: the Histories of al-Mas'ūdī,* Albany, 1979.

KHALĪFA IBN KHAYYĀṬ AL-'UṢFURĪ, *Ta'rīkh.* Ed. Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī. Najaf, 1386/1967.

AL-KHAṬĪB AL-BAGHDĀDĪ, *Ta'rīkh Baghdād.* Cairo, 1349/1931.

AL-KINDĪ, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-wulāt wa-kitāb al-quḍāt.* Ed. Rhuvon Guest. Leiden, 1912.

KISTER, Meir J., *"...illā bi-ḥaqqihi...* A study of an early *ḥadīth",* *JSAI* 5 (1984), 33-52.

LANDAU-TASSERON, Ella, "Sayf ibn 'Umar in medieval and modern scholarship", *Der Islam* 67 (1990), 1-26.

IDEM, "The participation of Ṭayy in the *ridda," JSAI* 5 (1984), 53-71.

IDEM, "Processes of Redaction": the case of the Tamīmite delegation to the Prophet Muhammad", *BSOAS,* 49 (1986), p. 253-270.

LEDER, Stefan, *Das Korpus al-Haitham ibn 'Adī (st. 207/822). Herkunft, Überlieferung, Gestalt früher texte der Akhbār Literatur,* Frankfurt am Main, 1991.

IDEM, "Authorship and transmission in unauthored literature", *Oriens* 31 (1988), 67-81.

IDEM, "Features of the novel in early historiography: the downfall of Xālid al-Qasrī," *Oriens* 32 (1990), 72-96.

AL-MARRĀKUSHĪ, 'Abd al-Wāḥid b. 'Alī, *Al-mu'jib fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-maghrib.* Ed. R.P.A. Dozy, 2nd ed. Leiden 1881.

AL-MASHHADĀNĪ, Muḥammad Jāsim Ḥamādī, *Mawārid al-Balādhurī 'an al-usra al-Umawiyya fī Ansāb al-ashrāf,* Mecca, 1407/1986.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

AL-MIZZĪ, Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, *Tuḥfat al-ashrāf bi-ma'rifat al-a'rāf.* Ed. 'Abd al-Ṣamad Sharaf al-Dīn. Bombay, 1384-1401/1965-81.

MURANYI, Miklos, "Ein neuer Bericht über die Wahl des ersten Kalifen Abū Bakr", *Arabica* 25 (1978), 233-260.

MURSĪ, Salwā Mamdūḥ, "'*Urwa ibn al-Zubayr wa-bidāyat madrasat al-maghāzī*". M. A. thesis, University of Jordan, 1979.

NOTH, Albrecht, "Der Charakter der ersten grossen Sammlungen von Nachrichten zur frühen Kalifenzeit", *Der Islam* 47 (1971), 168-99.

PEDERSEN, Johann, *The Arabic Book.* Ed. Robert Hillenbrand, trans. Geoffrey French. Princeton, 1984.

ROSENTHAL, Franz, *A History of Muslim Historiography.* 2nd. Ed. Leiden, 1968.

IDEM, The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship. Rome, 1947.

ROTTER, Gernot, "Zur Überlieferung einiger historischer Werke Madā'inīs in Ṭabarīs *Annalen*", *Oriens* 23-24 (1974), 103-33.

SACHAU, Eduard, "Das Berliner Fragment des Mūsā ibn 'Uqba", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1904. 445-71.

AL-ṢADR, Ḥasan, *Al-shī'a wa-funūn al-Islām.* Sidon, 1331/1912.

AL-SAMARRĀ'Ī, Qāsim Aḥmad, "Al-ijāza wa-taṭawwuruhā al-ta'rīkhī", *'Ālam al-kutub* 1 (1401/1981), 278-85.

AL-SAMŪK, S. M., *Die historischen Überlieferung nach Ibn Isḥāq, eine synoptische Untersuchung,* Ph. D. dissertation, Universität Frankfurt, 1978.

SCHACHT, Josef, "On Mūsā ibn 'Uqba's *Kitāb al-maghāzī*", *Acta Orientalia* 21 (1953), 288-300.

SCHOELER, Gregor, "Die Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im frühen Islam", *Der Islam* 62 (1985), 201-30.

SEZGIN, Fuat, *Bukhārī'nin kaynaklari hakkýnda arastirmalar,* Istanbul, 1956.

IDEM, Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums, I, Leiden, 1967.

SEZGIN, Ursula, "Abū Mikhnaf, Ibrāhīm b. Hilāl al-Thaqafī und Muḥammad b. A'tham über *ghārāt*", *ZDMG* 131 (1981), Wissenschaftliche Nachrichten, 1-2.

IDEM, Abū Mikhnaf. Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie der umaiyadischen Zeit, Leiden, 1971.

SHBOUL, Ahmad M. H., *Al-Mas'ūdī and his World: a Muslim Humanist and his Interest in non-Muslims,* London, 1979.

SPRENGER, Alois, "Notes on Alfred von Kremer's Edition of Wakidy's Campains, *JASB* 25 (1856), 53-75, 199-221.

IDEM, "On the origin and progress of writing down historical facts among the Musulmans", *JASB* 25 (1856), 303-29, 375-81.

AL-ṬABARĀNĪ, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad, *Al-mu'jam al-kabīr.* Ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī. Baghdad, 1397.

AL-ṬABARĪ, Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *Ta'rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk.* Ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo, 1960-8.

AL-'UMARĪ, Akram Ḍiyā', *Dirāsāt ta'rīkhiyya,* Medina, 1403/1983.

VAJDA, George, "Idjāza", *EI*^{2}, III, Leiden, 1971, 1021b-1021b.

AL-WĀQIDĪ, *Kitāb al-maghāzī.* Ed. Alfred von Kremer. Calcutta, 1855; the same, ed. Marsden Jones. London, 1966.

WERKMEISTER, Walter, "Parallelstellen-Verzeichnis zum *K. al-'iqd al-farīd* des Ibn 'Abdrabbihi", *Oriens* 32 (1990), 375-439.

IDEM, Quellenuntersuchungen zum Kitāb al-'Iqd al-Farīd des Andalusiers Ibn 'Abdrabbihi (246/860-328/940). Ein Beitrag zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte, Berlin, 1983.

ZAYDĀN, Jurjī, *Ta'rīkh ādāb al-lugha al-'arabiyya.* Cairo, 1911-14.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

ZOLONDEK, Leon, "An approach to the problem of the sources of the *Kitāb al-aghānī*", *JNES* 19 (1960), 217-34.
IDEM, "The sources of the *Kitāb al-aghānī*", *Arabica* 8 (1961), 294-308.

Some recent works relevant to the subject

BERG, H., *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam.* Curzon, 2000.
COOK, Michael, "The opponents of the writing of tradition in early Islam", *Arabica,* XLIV (1997), 437-530.
GOERKE, Andreas, *Das Kitâb al-Amwâl des Abû 'Ubaid al-Qâsim b. Sallâm. Entstehung und Überlieferung eines frühen Rechtswerkes*. Princeton 2003.
GÜNTHER, Sebastian, "Al-Nawfali's lost 'History'. A Shiite Source Used By al-Ṭabarī and Abū 'l-Faraj", in: Hugh Kennedy (ed.), *Tabari. The Historian and His Work,* forthcoming.
IDEM, "Maqatil-Literature in Medieval Islam", *The Journal of Arabic Literature*, 25.3 (1994), p. 193-212.
IDEM, "Assessing the Sources of Classical Arabic Compilations: The Issue of Categories and Methodologies", *British Journal of Middle East Studies*, 2004 (forthcoming).
IDEM, "... nor have I learned it from any book of theirs". Abu l-Faraj al-Isfahani: A Medieval Arabic Author at Work", in R. Brunner (ed.): *Islamstudien ohne Ende. Festschrift für den Islamwissenschaftler Werner Ende, hrsg. von R. Brunner [et al.],* Würzburg: Ergon, 2002, p. 139-153.
HOYLAND, Robert, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It.* Princeton, 1997, chapter 2.
IBN ḤUBAYSH, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, *Ghazawāt Ibn Ḥubaysh.* Ed. Suhayl Zakkar. Beirut, 1992.
LEDER, Stefan, "Grenzen der Rekonstruktion alten Schrifttums nach den Angaben im Fihrist", in *Ibn al-Nadīm und die Mittelalterliche arabische Literatur. Beiträge zum erste Johann Wilhelm Fück-Kolloquium*, Wiesbaden 1996, 21-31.
LINDSAY, James E. (ed.), *Ibn 'Asākir and Early Islamic History*. Princeton, 2001.
MOTZKI, Harald, ed., *The Biography of Muḥammad*. Leiden, 2000.
IDEM, "The Author and his Work in the Islamic Literature of the First Centuries: The Case of 'Abd al-Razzâq's *Muṣannaf*", *JSAI* 28 (2003), 171-201.
MURANYI, Miklos, "Ibn Isḥāq's *Kitāb al-maghazī* in der *riwāya* von Yūnus b. Bukayr. Bemerkungen zur frühen Überlieferungsgeschichte", *JSAI* 14 (1991), 214-275.
OSMAN, Ghada, "Oral vs. written transmission: the case of Ṭabarī and Ibn Sa'd", *Arabica,* XLVIII (2000), 66-80.
SCHOELER, Gregor, *Charakter und Authentie des muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Muhammeds*. Berlin, 1996.
IDEM, "Foundations for a new biography of Muhammad: The production and evaluation of the corpus of the traditions from 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr". In: *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamich Origins.* Ed. by Herbert Berg. Leiden and Boston, 2003.
IDEM, "Character and Authenticity of the Muslim Tradition on the life of Muhammad". *Arabica* 48, 3 (2002), 360-366.
IDEM, Ecrire et transmettre dans les débuts de I'Islam. Paris, 2002.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)

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.

(c) Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas http://al-qantara.revistas.csic.es
Licencia Creative Commons 3.0 España (by-nc)