

NEW DATA ON AN OLD MANUSCRIPT: AN ANDALUSIAN
VERSION OF THE WORKS ENTITLED *FUTŪḤ AL-SHĀM**

Ella LANDAU-TASSERON
The Hebrew University. Jerusalem

In 1847 Pascual de Gayangos purchased in Morocco an Arabic manuscript which he identified as *Futūḥ al-Shām* (*The Conquest of Syria*) by Wāqidī. Gayangos was misled by the header preceding the introduction to the work, which reads: «The master, scholar and spiritual leader, the learned Abū ‘Abdallāh Sīdī Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī, said...». By the time the collection of Gayangos was catalogued, two facts have emerged.¹ First, the text known as *Futūḥ al-Shām* is not a genuine work by Wāqidī. Secondly, the manuscript in question is not a copy of pseudo Wāqidī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*, but a work entitled *Al-durr al-naḥīs fī uns al-zā’in wa-l-jalīs* (*The Precious Pearl, Joy of the Traveler and the Stay-at-Home*). This is explicitly stated by the anonymous compiler in the introduction to the work. The header that seems to attribute the whole work, or at least the introduction, to Wāqidī, was evidently added by a hand later than the compiler’s.

Behind the florid name lies a wholly unoriginal work. The anonymous compiler states in his introduction that he stitched together parts of two texts, namely, the *Futūḥ al-Shām* by Wāqidī (which we now know to be a false ascription) and another, similar work by Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalamankī.² The manuscript contains 159 folios, the number of lines ranging between 25-28 per page, in a beautiful Magribī script. In such a long text I expected to find a clue to the compiler’s identity, such as an occasional *qāla* followed by the compiler’s name (like *qāla Abū Ja’far* in the *History* of Ṭabarī). I therefore carefully read the whole work, but to no avail. There is no clue as to the time, place or identity of the compiler. According to the colophon the book was «accomplished» (*najiza*) by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām b. Ḥassūn (? perhaps ‘Ashshūr) al-Ḥasanī al-Wazzānī al-Ṭiṭwānī al-Darqāwī. The idiom *najiza ‘alā yaday*, «was accomplished by», often occurs in colophons, referring to the copyists rather than the compilers.³ I could find no details about this Muḥammad

* I thank my colleague Maribel Fierro who kindly gave me the Gayangos manuscript, and was helpful whenever help was needed.

¹ See Terés Sádaba, *Manuscritos*, p. 27 (n.º XVIII).

² *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 1b.

³ I thank Jan Just Witkam, of the Leiden University Library, for confirming my impression in this matter on the basis of his rich experience.

b. Muḥammad, but the *nisba* Darqāwī gives a clue. It indicates Muḥammad's affiliation with the Ṣūfī order Darqāwa, which was founded in northern Morocco in the late 18th century.⁴ This means that Muḥammad b. Muḥammad lived at that period or later, and that our manuscript was «accomplished» no earlier than the late 18th century. The fact that Muḥammad b. Muḥammad is both late and not widely known seems to corroborate the impression that «accomplished» means «copied», not «compiled», in other words, that Muḥammad b. Muḥammad was the copyist and not the author of *Al-durr al-naḥīs*.

A fragment of *Al-durr* is kept at the library of the Escuela de Estudios Árabes in Granada.⁵ It is written in a much less pretty, yet legible Maghribī script. It is preceded by a page containing a piece of «useful information» (*fā'ida*) about the special magical qualities of certain Qur'ānic verses. This information, however, is not useful for supplying any clue as to the identity of the compiler or the provenance of the manuscript. Random samples (including the two *isnāds*, for which see below) indicate the close affinity of the texts contained in the two manuscripts of *Al-durr al-naḥīs*. A salient illustration of this fact is the mistaken variant, *minhāj* «custom», which occurs in both manuscripts instead of the correct version, *alladhī kāna hāja* «That which urged (Abū Bakr to act)».⁶ There is no colophon in the Granada manuscript, and there is nothing that I can at present add about it. Henceforth all the references in this article are to the Gayangos manuscript except when otherwise indicated.

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

⁴ I thank my colleague Frank Stewart for pointing out this fact to me. See *EP*, II, 160, s.v. «Darqāwa» (R. Le Tourneau). The works by O. Depont, X. Coppolani and G. Drague, cited by Le Tourneau, list many Darqāwī *shaykhs*, but I could not identify Muḥammad b. Muḥammad among them.

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

⁶ The structure of the sentence leaves no doubt as to the correct version. *Al-durr al-naḥīs* fol. 12b l. 8, Granada ms. 38; the correct form is found in Azdī, *Futūḥ al-Shām*, 53. The mistake probably originated in a variant that read *mimmā hāja* (instead of *alladhī hāja*).

assembled from various sources and processed into new texts. It is not known who the speaker is in this case, but the statement is by no means correct. Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq and Sayf b. ‘Umar were not mentioned «at the beginning of the volume» nor anywhere else in *Al-durr al-naḥīs*. Throughout the work only two texts are cited, precisely as stated in the introduction, namely, the works by (pseudo) Wāqidi and Ṭalamankī.

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

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

THE ISNĀDS

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

⁷ E.g. the 1997 edition, by Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmiyya, Beirut.

⁸ See Sivan, *L’Islam*, 197-99; Conrad, «Al-Azdī’s history», 33 and the literature cited there.

⁹ See Fierro, «El proceso».

Abū ‘Umar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Muqri’ al-Ṭalamankī
 ↓
 Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī al-Zanādīm (*sic*)
 ↓
 Abū al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
 ↓
 Abū Ismā‘īl ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ishāq al-Jawharī al-Baghdādī
 ↓
 al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
 ↓
 Abū Ismā‘īl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh.

On fol. 12b there is another version of the chain, which runs as follows:

Abū ‘Umar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Muqri’
 ↓
 Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Mufarrij
 ↓
 Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ḥasan b. Ishāq al-Baghdādī al-Jawharī
 ↓
 al-Walīd b. Ḥāmid al-Rumaylī
 ↓
 al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād
 ↓
 Abū Ismā‘īl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh - his father.¹⁰

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

¹⁰ The Granada ms. is identical, the *isnāds* are recorded on 3 and 37 respectively.

¹¹ Fiero, «El proceso», 98; Hermosilla Llisterrí, «Una versión», 63-7.

I could find nothing on the 3rd link recorded on fol. 1b, Abū al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād. This name may be a «filling» emulating the penultimate link, al-Ḥasan (read: al-Ḥusayn) b. Ziyād.

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

Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ishāq al-Baghdādī
 ↓
 al-Walīd b. Ḥammād al-Ramlī
 ↓
 al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād al-Ramlī
 ↓
 Abū Ismā‘īl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Azdī al-Baṣrī

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

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

¹² The identification by ‘Āmir, who published the work in 1970, is wrong, see ‘Umarī, *Dirāsāt*, 71-2, and below.

¹³ See Conrad, «Al-Azdī’s history», 29.

¹⁴ Ibn Khayr, *Fahrasa*, I, 238 (also cited by Conrad, «Al-Azdī’s history», 57).

¹⁵ See the full chain down to al-Silafī in both printed editions of Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* (see the bibliography at the end of this article). Three manuscripts are mentioned by Sivan, *L’Islam*, 199, two of them in Berlin and one in Paris. See also GAS, I, 292-293; Kaḥḥāla, *Mu’jam al-mu’allifin*, III, 429 (the material cited there refers to Nassau’s edition and is not very helpful). Ahlwardt mistook the Berlin mss.

from al-Silafī onwards, with two additional links connecting al-Silafī with Ibn al-‘Adīm (d. 660/1262). The latter included in his *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī ta’rīkh Ḥalab* five passages from Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*, with the full *isnād*.¹⁶

The first three links transmitting from Azdī, namely, ‘Alī b. Aḥmad, al-Walīd b. Ḥammād and al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād, are thus common to the Andalusian (both Ṭalamankī and Ibn Khayr), Egyptian and Egypto-Syrian *isnāds* which narrated Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*. However, these three individuals are not very well known. ‘Alī b. Aḥmad was a traditionist who died in Egypt after 340/951-2.¹⁷ His biography contains no indication that he had anything to do with the study of historical material in general or the *Futūḥ al-Shām* in particular. Nevertheless, among those who transmitted traditions from ‘Alī b. Aḥmad, Dhahabī lists one Munīr b. Aḥmad. Dhahabī supplies no details, but it turns out that this Munīr is the same person who transmitted Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* from ‘Alī b. Aḥmad to the Egyptian (and Egypto-Syrian) transmitters, culminating in al-Silafī and Ibn al-‘Adīm.¹⁸ The genuineness of this part of the Egyptian *isnād* is thus unwittingly corroborated by Dhahabī.

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

Al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād is virtually unknown. There is a person by this name who is described as «negligible, unknown» (*martūk majhūl*). No details are given, except that he transmitted material from Muqātil b. Sulaymān.²⁰ Since Muqātil died in 150/767-8, this al-Ḥusayn seems too early to have been the informant of al-Walīd b. Ḥammād (who died around 300/912-3). Ibn ‘Asākir mentions one al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād al-Simsār al-Ramlī who transmitted from one Aḥmad b. al-Mu’ammil al-Dimashqī; no further details are given.²¹ The name

of Azdī’s work for the (pseudo) Wāqidī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* (Ahlwardt 9767 and 9768). The Paris ms. (n.º 1664) was edited by W. N. Lees (in 1854). The second editor, ‘Abd al-Mun’im ‘Āmir (in 1970), claims that he used a manuscript from a private collection, but this is dubious, see Conrad, note 18. Notwithstanding, the variations between Lees, 90-1 and ‘Āmir, 100-103 suggest that ‘Āmir did have additional material (although not necessarily a manuscript of *Futūḥ al-Shām*).

¹⁶ Ibn al-‘Adīm, *Bughyat al-ṭalab*, I, 69-70, 569, 572; III, 1336; VII, 3150.

¹⁷ Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XV, 474-5. The editor remarks that he found nowhere else a biography of ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ishāq. My own efforts in this matter were unsuccessful as well.

¹⁸ See notes 15 and 16 above. On Munīr b. Aḥmad see Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XVII, 267, XVIII, 496; Ḥabbāl, *Wafayāt*, I, 56.

¹⁹ Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XIV, 78-9. See also Conrad, 57.

²⁰ See Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, II, 348; Dhahabī, *Mizān*, I, 535 («Al-Azdī» mentioned in these two sources is not Abū Ismā‘īl, author of *Futūḥ al-Shām*, but Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Azdī).

²¹ Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh Dimashq*, VI, 40.

al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād occurs in the *isnāds* of several *ḥadīths*, but my investigation of these invariably led to a dead end.

The pair al-Walīd b. Ḥammād al-Ramlī - al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād must not be confused with al-Walīd b. Ḥammād (al-Lu'lu'ī, al-Kūfī) - al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād (al-Lu'lu'ī).²²

The *isnāds* recorded in the anonymous *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, although garbled, indicate that Ṭalamankī's compilation, incorporated in *Al-durr*, contained material from *Futūḥ al-Shām* by Azdī. Moreover, the compiler of *Al-durr al-naḥīs* very often refers the quotations from Ṭalamankī back to Abū Ismā'īl, namely, al-Azdī. We may now turn to the text to check this conclusion further.

THE TEXT

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

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

²² Conrad, «Al-Azdī's history», 57-8 seems to be confusing them when he cites evidence that al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād was a Shī'ī. The Shī'ī one was al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Lu'lu'ī, see Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, I, 291. See also Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, VI, 269; Qurashī, *Jawāhir*, III, 579.

²³ All the references to Azdī are to 'Āmir's edition unless otherwise stated.

²⁴ E.g. fol. 80b l. 8, cf. Azdī 152 l. 11; 88a l. 12, cf. Azdī 199 l. 5; 100b l. 20, cf. Azdī, 226 l. 7; fol. 148b l. 3, cf. Azdī 242 l. 12. See also 80b l. 19 where the compiler picks up Azdī's narrative in the middle, Azdī 152 l. 13.

of» are sometimes missing. The names following the term «on the authority of» are either Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdī al-Baṣrī (usually in a shortened form), or the sources used by Azdī, or a combination of the two. When Ṭalamankī says «I was told by», one should not be misled: except in the two cases discussed above (namely, fols. 1b and 12b), Ṭalamankī was not told anything by anyone; he merely copied Azdī’s *isnāds*. A phrase such as «Abū al-Zinād told me» is Azdī’s; copied by Ṭalamankī, it makes the wrong impression.²⁵ Of course such occurrences may have arisen not from Ṭalamankī’s methodology, but from the cut and paste procedures of the anonymous compiler.

Collating all these passages quoted from Ṭalamankī with the published (Silafī’s) version of Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* was a laborious, lengthy task. It may be summarized in one sentence: except for two cases, every quotation from Ṭalamankī in *al-Durr al-naḥīs* is found in Azdī’s text.²⁶ A third passage, seemingly quoted from Ṭalamankī and lacking in Azdī, turned out to be a quotation from pseudo-Wāqidi.²⁷ This means that Ṭalamankī’s «compilation» is merely a transmission of Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*. Had Ṭalamankī composed a genuine work on *Futūḥ al-Shām*, we would expect at least some of the numerous quotations from him to be derived from works other than Azdī’s. This conclusion would explain why Ṭalamankī’s biographers never credit him with a work on *Futūḥ*, and why his «compilation» remains nameless throughout *Al-durr al-naḥīs*. Apparently the anonymous compiler of *Al-durr* mistook a copy of Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*, transmitted by Ṭalamankī, for a genuine work by the latter.

Ṭalamankī’s version of Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* is plainly different from Silafī’s as published by Lees and ‘Āmir. A systematic examination of the textual variations shows that almost without exception, the two published texts are alike, and Ṭalamankī’s version different.²⁸ The variations, however, although countless, are typically minor. They are of various kinds. The order of the words or the arrangement of the sentence is sometimes different, such as: *kitābunā wa-nabiyyunā* in one version, *nabiyyunā wa-kitābunā* in the other; *wa-kāna bi-l-yamāma wajjahahu ilā Musaylima* vs. *wa-huwa bi-l-yamāma wa-kāna wajjahahu ilā Musaylima...*²⁹. Alternative synonymous words, or different

²⁵ *Al-durr al-naḥīs* fol. 14a l. 23. On the phenomenon of secondary quotations see Landau-Tasserón, «On the reconstruction of lost sources».

²⁶ The exceptions are a) *Al-durr al-naḥīs* fol. 54b l. 25-55a l. 14. The last four lines, however, are woven into Azdī’s text in another place, 102 ll. 15-18, and 103 ll. 13-14, and b) the final passage of *Al-durr al-naḥīs*. For the list of the collated passages see appendix.

²⁷ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 44b l. 18-45a penult., see ps. Wāqidi, *Futūḥ al-Shām*, I, 71-2.

²⁸ Rare exceptions are: Ṭalamankī 114a lines 14-19 = Lees 231, whereas in ‘Āmir 255 a few words are omitted; Ṭalamankī 116a l. 22 (*lam asma’*) = Lees, 239 l. 8, whereas ‘Āmir 266 line 2 has *lam ara*.

²⁹ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 63a l. 14 vs. Azdī, 120 l. 11; fol. 12b l. 22 vs. Azdī, 54, l. 9-10.

expressions conveying the same meaning, occur frequently, such as *aṣwāt* in one version, *nidā'* in the other; *fa-amiddanā* vs. *fa-asri' ilaynā*; *qāla wāḥid min al-muslimīn* vs. *qāla rājiz*; *ya'izu al-nās* vs. *yaquṣṣu 'alā al-nās*; *lā yastaḥī'u* vs. *lā yuḥīqu*.³⁰ Omissions and additions, both intentional and otherwise, are there as well.³¹ Omissions of whole passages in Ṭalamankī may be due to the editorial work of the anonymous compiler of *Al-durr*.³²

Rarely, Ṭalamankī's text says something different from, or even contradictory to Silafī's version: *min qibali maysaratihim* vs. *'alā maymanatihim*; *lā af'alu* vs. *af'alu*; *ammara 'alayhā wa-ṣālahā ahlahā*, vs. *ammana ahlahā wa-ṣalahūhu*; *fa-kāna dhalika min ta'jil al-ṣulḥ* vs. *fa-kāna dhalika mim mā yamna'uhu min ta'jil al-ṣulḥ*; *fa-addū al-jizya 'an yadin wa-antum ṣāghirūn* vs. *fa-addū al-jizya ilaynā fī kull 'ām wa-antum ṣāghirūn*; *wa-lā yughayyirūna wa-lā yanquḍūna* vs. *fa-l-yughayyirunna wa-l-yanquḍunna*.³³ Some, but not all, of these variations may be mistakes or careless omissions. It also happens that, due to the cut and paste method used by the anonymous compiler, the sequence of events in *Al-durr al-naḥīs* is different from Silafī's version of Azdī.³⁴

Names of people and places are often garbled in Ṭalamankī's version. Some are undoubtedly copyist errors, such as Ayla instead of al-Ubulla, or Antāj/Intāj instead of Nibāj.³⁵ Others seem to indicate different narrations.³⁶ Sometimes Ṭalamankī's version reveals a specific Andalusian orientation. The constant

³⁰ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 66a line 3, vs. Azdī, 136 line 5; fol. 13a, l. 25, vs. 58, l. 3; fol. 15b l. 10 vs. 75 l. 13; fol. 65a l. 19 vs. 131 l. 2; 96a l. 17 vs. 215 l. 4.

³¹ Compare, for example: *Al-durr*; fol. 7b lines 17-19 with Azdī, 51 lines 5-6, 10, and Azdī-Lees, 44 l. 1; fols. 84b l. 7, where a passage occurring in Azdī, 166 ll. 4-9 is missing. Omissions sometimes do not affect the text, at other times they change its meaning, see e.g. *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 61a l. 2 vs. Azdī 107 l. 5.

³² E.g. Azdī, 56 2nd paragraph (its place in Ṭalamankī is 13b line 12); Azdī 62 l. 2-63 l. 10 (its place in Ṭalamankī: 13b penult.). For another salient example, see *Al-durr al-naḥīs* 14b ll. 22-26 as compared to Azdī, 69 ult. 71 l. 1.

³³ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 66a line 5 vs. Azdī, 136 line 7; fol. 116a l. 25 vs. Azdī, 266, l. 10; fol. 14a l. 1, vs. Azdī, 63 l. 11; fol. 44b l. 18 vs. Azdī, 98 l. 3; fol. 62b l. 25 vs. Azdī, 118 l. 17; 108b l. 7 vs. 234 l. 17. See also fol. 55a vs. Azdī, 102-3, where the versions are quite different; fol. 44b vs. Azdī, 96, where the description of the battle is different; fol. 66a l. 11 ff. vs. Azdī, 137 ll. 1 ff., where the content of Mu'ādh's address is different (there is also a passage missing in Azdī here, occurring in *Al-durr*; 66a ll. 15-25); fol. 28a ult. vs. Azdī, 85 ll. 9-12, where Ṭalamankī's version seems like a summary of Azdī.

³⁴ See e.g. 'Umar's procedures in *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fols. 113a-115b compared to Azdī, 253-7.

³⁵ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 13a l. 19, 22, and 13b l. 1-Azdī, 57 ll. 8, 13, and 58 l. 4; *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, 13b, ll. 5, 18-Azdī, 59 l. 1, and 61 l. 5. See also *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 14b l. 23, «Ṣandawīd», read by 'Amir as «Mandawā», Azdī, 70 note 1. Ibn Ḥubaysh has «Ṣaydūdā», which the editor read «Ṣandūdā», Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Al-ghazawāt wa-l-futūḥ*, I, 183.

³⁶ The commander of the cavalry is Zayd b. 'Amr b. Nufayl in Silafī's version, Azdī, 96 l. 4 (but see also l. 6), Sa'īd b. Zayd in Ṭalamankī, *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 44b l. 2. The name Banū Sahn

threat in al-Andalus were the Christian powers, the counterparts of the Byzantines of early Islām. This, I think, is the origin of the following variations: Nahr al-Damm, «the river of blood», became in Ṭalamankī's version Nahr al-Rūm, «the river of the Byzantines».³⁷ Jābān, who is described in Silafī's version as «one of the nobles of the 'Ajam» (usually meaning Persians), became Jāfān, «one of the nobles of the Byzantines» in Ṭalamankī's version.³⁸ «Tell him to withstand the people» (*muwāqafat al-qawm*) in Silafī's version, is «tell him to fight the Byzantines» (*muwāqa'at al-rūm*) in Ṭalamankī's version.³⁹ However, there is also an inverse example, where Silafī's version uses the term *rūm* whereas Ṭalamankī's employs a different term.⁴⁰ Certain omissions may be due to Andalusian orientation as well. A rather important passage, referring to internal divisions of the Arabs in Syria, is omitted in Ṭalamankī's version, perhaps because it made no sense to Andalusians.⁴¹ Again, it is perhaps the anonymous compiler of *Al-durr al-nafis* who is responsible for this omission.

THE MAKING OF TEXTS

The collation of the various versions of *Futūḥ al-Shām* affords some general insights into the making of texts.

A remarkable phenomenon occurs twice in the Ṭalamankī's text as rendered in *Al-durr al-nafis*: a gloss, or an explanation, that was written on the margin of Silafī's version is incorporated into the text of *Al-durr*.⁴² As a rule, such an occurrence would indicate that Silafī preserved a version older than Ṭalamankī's, at least in this case. But there is no way of knowing whether it was Ṭalamankī himself, or the compiler of *Al-durr al-nafis*, or even a later copyist, who incorporated the explanatory sentences into the narrative. At any

of the Quraysh, in Azdī 138 penult., is rendered Tamīm in *Al-durr al-nafis*, fol. 66b l. 13 (Sahm and Tamīm can be confused on orthographical grounds). Of course Silafī's version may be garbled as well, especially in 'Āmir's edition, see 'Umarī, *Dirāsāt*, 78-9.

³⁷ Azdī, 63 ll. 12-13 cf. Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḫ*, III, 345 l. 18; *Al-durr*, fol. 14a l. 2.

³⁸ Azdī, 63 l. 12; *Al-Durr*, 14a l. 1. 'Ajam in Silafī's version must be «Persians» since the account is about the conquest of Ulayyis, near al-Anbār.

³⁹ *Al-durr al-nafis*, fol. 61a l. 13 vs. Azdī, 108 l. 10, *muwāqafa* and *muwāqa'a* are of course very similar orthographically. Perhaps the variation 'ilj (Azdī, 178 l. 14) vs. *al-bitrīq* (*Al-durr al-nafis*, fol. 94a l. 20), belongs to the same category.

⁴⁰ *Arḍ al-Rūm* vs. *arḍ al-urdunn*, Azdī, 140 penult. vs. *Al-durr al-nafis*, fol. 67a l. 7.

⁴¹ The passage is in Azdī, 168 l. 13-169 l. 14.

⁴² *Al-durr al-nafis*, fols. 14b ll. 11-14 and 47a l. 12 vs. Azdī, 68 last three lines, and 98 ll. 14-5.

rate, this phenomenon gives us a glimpse into the making of texts: a later addition becomes an indistinguishable part of the original text.

Another such glimpse is provided by what may be called wandering passages, or building blocks. The collation of the texts reveals that certain sentences, or passages, are variously incorporated into texts. For example, in the story of Abū 'Ubayda's dismissal, there is a description of the messenger who brought the news, and the reaction of Abū 'Ubayda and the Muslims upon receiving it. In Ṭalamankī's version the story ends with the text of Abū Bakr's letter of dismissal. Silafī's version omits the text of the letter and goes on with the narrative. The omitted text occurs later in Silafī's version within a different context.⁴³ In another instance, sentences and expressions that form part of Abū Bakr's letter to the people of Yemen occur in another account as part of Abū Bakr's speech to the tribesmen gathered near Medina.⁴⁴ Yet another case is a passage that forms part of 'Umar's letter to Abū 'Ubayda and Mu'ādh in Silafī's version. The same passage occurs in Ṭalamankī's narration as part of Abū 'Ubayda's address to Khālid b. al-Walid.⁴⁵ These textual events are different from the familiar phenomena of the topos and the theme. The latter two are a sort of forms into which actual contents are poured or adapted, but wandering passages are the very actual contents transferred between narratives, pieces of texts which transmitters handled with surprising freedom. My impression is that such freedom is more characteristic of early texts than of later ones, just as transmission of *ḥadīth* by content (*bi-l-ma'nā*) rather than verbatim was an early phenomenon that disappeared in later times. At any rate, it seems that letters and addresses are specially prone to wandering between narratives, but the phenomenon occurs on other occasions as well.⁴⁶ Of course this is related to the technique of cut and paste used by compilers.

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

⁴³ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 16b ll. 10-24, vs. Azdī, 72 ll. 10-7, and 86 ll. 5-8.

⁴⁴ *Inna allāha kataba 'alā al-mu'minīna al-jihāda farīḍatan min farā'id allāhi ta'ālā wa-al-thawābu 'inda allāhi 'aẓimun... wa-sāri'ū 'ibāda allāhi ilā farīḍati rabbikum... wa-innamā hiya iḥdā al-ḥusnayayni*, *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 5b ll. 20-4, vs. Azdī, 8 and Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Ghazawāt*, I, 148-9. The passage in *Al-durr al-naḥīs* is quoted from Wāqidi's *Futūḥ al-Shām*, but I could not trace it in that work (ed. 'Abd al-Laṭīf 'Abd al-Raḥmān). There are, however, many versions of Wāqidi's *Futūḥ al-Shām*. Compare also the sentence *la-unsayanna al-rūm wasāwis al-shayṭān bi-Khālid b. al-Walid* in Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḥ*, III, 408 and Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Ghazawāt*, I, 180.

⁴⁵ Azdī, 102 ll. 15-18 vs. *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 55a ll. 11-13. See also *ibid.*, fol. 12a ll. 18-21 vs. Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Ghazawāt*, I, 180.

⁴⁶ Cf. also the anecdote in *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 15a ll. 16-9, differently told in Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḥ*, III, 416-7.

he sometimes inserts even one sentence from the other. Since he mentions the source even of such an isolated sentence, the seam is obvious. We can imagine how a new version, in fact a new text is created, when the compiler decides to omit the indication of the source.⁴⁷ The new text is also augmented by connectives, or explanatory sentences. Working by the cut and paste method, compilers must sometimes add explanatory sentences that were not necessary in the original text. Thus Ṭalamankī (or the compiler of *Al-durr al-naḥīs*) omits the text of a letter by Abū ‘Ubayda, but adds a sentence to explain the gist of that letter (Abū ‘Ubayda’s fear of the Byzantines), which in turn leads to the next stage of the story (appointment of Khālīd b. al-Walīd over Abū ‘Ubayda).⁴⁸ In another place Ṭalamankī summarizes a significant part of a letter attributed to ‘Umar, rephrasing the content in two lines.⁴⁹

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

THE AUTHENTICITY OF AZDĪ’S *FUTŪḤ AL-SHĀM*

No hard facts are available regarding Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdī and the provenance of the *Futūḥ al-Shām* attributed to him. A version of the work, transmitted by the 13th century Egyptian scholar Abū Ṭāhir al-Silafī, was found in the middle of the 19th century and edited by William Nassau Lees (in 1854). Lees concluded from the *isnāds* contained in the text that Azdī had lived in the second century AH/eighth century CE. Michael Jan de Goeje rejected Lees’ analysis. He argued a) that no biographical source supplied details on Azdī, b) that four of the six transmitters linking Azdī to Silafī were untraceable as well, and c) that no author earlier than Dhahabī (d. 747/1347) referred to the work. De Goeje concluded therefore that Azdī had never existed, and that «his» *Futūḥ al-Shām* was a fraud of the Crusaders’ time, analogous to *Futūḥ al-Shām* attributed to Wāqīdī. Eventually Lees himself was convinced of de Goeje’s thesis.⁵⁰ Emanuel Sivan doubted the analogy between the two works entitled *Futūḥ al-Shām*. In his

⁴⁷ See e.g. the «stitches» in *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 115b ll. 24-5; 116a l. 11; 116b l. 4.

⁴⁸ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 14b ll. 4-5, whereas in Azdī, 67, the text of the letter is recorded. That letter occurs in Ṭalamankī’s version earlier, on 12a ll. 18-21.

⁴⁹ *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 47a l. 24-48 l. 2, compare to Azdī, 102 ll. 3-18. See also *Al-durr al-naḥīs*, fol. 61a l. 10 vs. Azdī, 108 ll. 1-2.

⁵⁰ De Goeje, *Mémoires*, 2nd edition, preface.

opinion Azdī's *Futūḥ al-Shām* was an early work, contrary to pseudo-Wāqidī's text.⁵¹ The second editor of Azdī's work, 'Abd al-Mun'im 'Āmir, claimed to have identified Azdī, but his identification is wrong.⁵² More recently Lawrence I. Conrad argued quite convincingly that Azdī's text originated in Syria in the second century AH/eighth century CE. His analysis is based on textual internal criteria of various kinds, and he also found that, prior to Dhahabī, Ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī (d. 575/1179-80) knew the *Futūḥ al-Shām* by Azdī.⁵³ Conrad was not able to produce new personal details about Azdī.

Conrad has reservations about his own analysis, being as it is based mainly on arguments from silence.⁵⁴ His conclusions may now be reinforced by new evidence. First, bio-bibliographical references to Azdī, which were deemed non-existent, are found in the literature. Secondly, three of the four transmitters deemed unknown (and therefore imaginary) by de Goeje can be traced in the sources. Thirdly, not only the transmitters, but also the transmission of *Futūḥ al-Shām* indicate an early date of the text. In what follows I briefly discuss these three points.

a) Bio-bibliographical references to Azdī occur in biographies of some of his authorities. Azdī is listed among those who transmitted from 'Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal, alongside Abū Mikhnaf and Ibn 'Uyayna, and also among the transmitters from al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd.⁵⁵ It should be noted that the sources which mention Azdī are late, namely Mizzī, Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar. Azdī's name is missing from the biographies of 'Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd as recorded in the earlier sources, such as Bukhārī, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Muslim and Ibn Ḥibbān. However, conclusions from this fact must be drawn with caution, for Azdī is not the only one who was ignored by these early sources. They also fail to mention Abū Mikhnaf in the list of transmitters from 'Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal; nor do they mention Sayf b. 'Umar as a transmitter from al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd, although the chain Sayf-al-Qāsim occurs many times in Ṭabarī's *History*.

b) The unknown transmitters from Azdī to Silafī turn out to have been real persons. I have already discussed 'Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ishāq and Munīr b. Aḥmad al-Khashshāb.⁵⁶ If there was any doubt that Munīr al-Khashshāb had ever

⁵¹ Sivan, *L'Islam*, 197-9. Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī is in fact of the same opinion, 'Umarī, *Dirāsāt*, 69-73.

⁵² See 'Umarī, *Dirāsāt*, 71-2 (69-79 are a devastating critique of 'Āmir's edition).

⁵³ See Conrad, «Al-Azdī's History» (a survey of the preceding discussion: *ibid.*, 28-9; Ibn Khayr cited: *ibid.*, 57).

⁵⁴ Conrad, «Al-Azdī's History», 59.

⁵⁵ Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, XVIII, 429; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, VI, 379; Dhahabī, *Kāshif*, I, 670 ('Abd al-Malik b. Nawfal); Mizzī, *op. cit.* XXIII, 458 (al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd).

⁵⁶ See above, p. 366.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4) An anecdote depicting a conversation between Khālīd b. al-Walīd and ʿAbd al-Masīh b. ʿAmr of Ḥīra is adduced by Abū Mikhnaḥ on the authority of Ḥamza b. ʿAlī —a man of the tribe Bakr b. Wāʿil—. Azdī quotes the same story from Abū al-Muthannā al-Kalbī.⁶³

⁵⁷ Ḥabbāl, *Wafayāt*, I, 56.

⁵⁸ Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XVIII, 496. Al-Ḥabbāl's book, *Wafayāt al-miṣriyyīn*, was published in Riyāḍ in 1408/1988.

⁵⁹ He is called al-Ḥusayn in Silafī's version of Azdī, Aḥmad in Ibn al-ʿAdīm's quotations, for which see above, note 16. ʿAmir claims that he died in Fustāṭ in 513 AH (typically, no reference to any source is given for this information). Ibn Musabbih is not listed among Silafī's numerous source, for which see Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XXI, 5-39.

⁶⁰ Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾriḫ Dimashq*, II, 63 (cf. 61), Azdī, 1-2 respectively. Al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb b. Fuqaym al-Wālibī, unknown to authors of the biographical works, is quoted by both Sayf b. ʿUmar and Abū Mikhnaḥ, see Ṭabarī, *Taʾriḫ*, IV, 435, 555, 556, etc. (see the index to Ṭabarī's *Taʾriḫ*).

⁶¹ Ṭabarī, *Taʾriḫ*, III, 367 and Ibn Ḥubaysh, II, 41 (=419), Azdī, 66, respectively. Ismāʿīl is a well known traditionist who died in 145/762-3 or 146/763-4, see Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *Tadhkirah*, I, 153; ʿIjlī, *Maʾrifat al-thiqāt*, I, 224. Ismāʿīl is known to have transmitted from the Successor (*tābiʿī*) Qays b. Abī Ḥāzīm on whom see Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, III, 266.

⁶² Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Ghazawāt*, II, 6 (384), Azdī, 53 respectively.

⁶³ Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, III, 345, Azdī, 64, respectively. Ḥamza b. ʿAlī b. Mukhfir or Muḥaffiz, is an obscure figure. He did, however, supply information not only to Abū Mikhnaḥ but also to Sayf b.

5) Abū Mikhnaf quotes a letter from Khālīd b. al-Walīd to the people of al-Madā'in, on the authority of Sha'bī - al-Mujālid b. Sa'īd. Azdī quotes the same letter on the authority of Sha'bī - al-Mujālid b. Sa'īd and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd.⁶⁴ All three links, i.e. 'Āmir al-Sha'bī, al-Mujālid b. Sa'īd and al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd are well known. Al-Qāsim b. al-Walīd is also cited by Sayf b. 'Umar on a number of occasions.⁶⁵

William Nassau Lees and Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī placed Azdī in the second century merely on the basis of the death dates of his authorities. *Isnāds*, as is well known, may be forged. Therefore, the above-mentioned passages are much stronger evidence of Azdī's time. They prove that not only the sources, but also the actual material was shared by Azdī and other, much more well-known second century authors. The biographical works tend to deal with scholars of the religious sciences and to neglect the historians, a fact that accounts for the lack of biographical details about them. As already mentioned, the early biographical sources ignored not only Azdī but also Abū Mikhnaf and Sayf b. 'Umar.⁶⁶ As a matter of fact not only Azdī is obscure. Very few details are known about Sayf b. 'Umar too, yet his existence was never placed under any doubt.

The known citations from Azdī's *Futūḥ al-Shām* and the references to it occur in late sources (Ibn Ḥajar, d. 859/1445-6, Dhahabī, d. 747/1347), which led de Goeje to the conclusion that the work was a late fraud. As already mentioned, Conrad found a reference to Azdī in Ibn Khayr (575/1179-80).⁶⁷ But there are quotations from Azdī already in the third century AH/ninth century CE. The traditionist and historian Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī quotes two passages on the authority of al-Walīd b. Ḥammād - al-Ḥusayn b. Ziyād - Azdī, namely, the same chain that transmitted *Futūḥ al-Shām*. Dūlābī indeed is known to have transmitted directly from al-Walīd b. Ḥammād (d. around 300/912-3).⁶⁸ One of these two passages is found independently in two sources, namely, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's *Istī'āb* and Ibn 'Asākir's *Ta'rīkh Dimashq*.⁶⁹ Although I could not trace it in any of the extant texts of *Futūḥ al-Shām* (including Ṭalamankī's), I believe that it is taken from

'Umar, see Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, 470 (also on the authority of a man of the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il). He is defined as «unknown» (*majhūl*), see Ḥusaynī, *Ikmāl*, I, 107. I could not trace Abū al-Muthannā al-Kalbī.

⁶⁴ Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, III, 346, and Azdī, 66, respectively.

⁶⁵ See the index to Ṭabarī's *Ta'rīkh*.

⁶⁶ See above, p. 373.

⁶⁷ See above, p. 373.

⁶⁸ Dhahabī, *Siyar*, XIV, 78.

⁶⁹ Ibn 'Asākir does sometimes quote Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, but this particular passage from Dūlābī reached him through other sources. See Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rīkh Dimashq*, LXV, 252 (with the full *isnād* from Dūlābī to Ibn 'Asākir); Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, III, 1417.

that work, as it deals with the appointment of Mu‘āwiya over Syria. The other passage quoted by Dūlābī is found in Ibn ‘Asākir, and in Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām*.⁷⁰ On the basis of these two passages alone, quoted by Dūlābī who died in 310/922-3, it is clear that Azdī’s *Futūḥ al-Shām* existed as early as the turn of the fourth century AH/tenth century CE. There is in fact no reason to doubt that it originated in the second century.

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

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

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

⁷⁰ Azdī, *Futūḥ al-Shām*, 149; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh Dimashq*, VII, 464 (*isnād* identical with the former, see previous note).

⁷¹ Ibn Ḥubaysh, *Ghazawāt*, I, 9.

⁷² See e.g. Ibn Ḥubaysh, I, 143, 147-8, 173, 184-6 = Azdī, 2, 8, 51-2, 70-3, respectively.

APPENDIX

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

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

⁷³ See above note 39.

87a l. 24-88a l. 12	195 l. 9-199 l. 5
88a l. 23-90a l. 1	199 l. 6-207 l. 11
90b l. 22-91a l. 17	189 l. 10-191 l. 10
93b 1.9-94a l. 10	175 l. 9-177 ult.
94a l. 15-94b l. 7	178 l. 5-179 ult.
94b l. 15-95a l. 5	207 l. 9-210 l. 8
96a l. 11-96b l. 4	214 l. 10-216 ult.
97a ll. 23-28	219 ll. 5-13
100a l. 28-100b l. 7	224 ll. 1-17
100b ll. 7-20	225 l. 1-226 l. 7
107a ll. 10-21	233 l. 8-234 l. 6
108b ll. 4-22	234 l. 11-236 l. 15
110a l. 28-110b l. 25	242 penult.-247 penult.
111b l. 17-112a l. 6	248 l. 6-249 l. 9
112a l. 20-112b l. 7	249 l. 10-250 l. 13
113a l. 28-113b l. 9	256 l. 15-257 l. 12
114a ll. 2-10	253 l. 11-254 l. 6
114a ll. 14-20	255 l. 8-256 l. 3
115b ll. 15-24	254 l. 12-255 l. 7
115b l. 25-116a l. 26	262 l. 16-266 l. 12
116b l. 4	259 ll. 11-12 ⁷⁴
147b ll. 9-13	236 l. 17-237 l. 2
147b l. 13-148b l. 3	237 l. 8-242 l. 11
156a l. 12-156b l. 2	267 l. 1-268 l. 17
156b ll. 2-11	273 ll. 1-16
156b l. 11-157a l. 16	268 l. 17-272 l. 5
157a ll. 16-19	272 ll. 8-11
157a l. 19-158a l. 5	273 l. 19-277 l. 7
158a l. 5-158b l. 11	280 l. 16-283 l. 15 ⁷⁵
158b l. 19-159a l. 17 ⁷⁶	no parallel

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Azdī, Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh, *The Fotooh al-Shām*, ed. William Nassau Lees, Calcutta, 1854.
- Idem*, *Ta’rikh futūḥ al-Shām*, ed. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im ‘Abdallāh ‘Āmir, Cairo, 1970.
- CONRAD, L. I., «Al-Azdī’s History of the Arab Conquests in Bilad al-Sham», in M. A. Bakhit (ed.), *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.*, vol. 1, Amman 1987, 28-61.

⁷⁴ I am not sure that this is the parallel. Both texts identify Ka‘b al-Aḥbār but each of them says something different.

⁷⁵ End of Azdī in Silafī’s version.

⁷⁶ End of *Al-durr al-naḥīs*.

- Dhahabī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Al-kāshif*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Awāma, Judda, 1992.
- Idem*, *Siyar a’lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ūt and Ḥusayn al-Asad, Beirut, 1981-8.
- Idem*, *Mizān al-I’tidāl*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, Beirut, n.d.
- FIERRO, M. I., «El proceso contra Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalamankī a través de su vida y de su obra», *Sharq al-Andalus IX* (1993), 93-127.
- DE GOEJE, M. J., *Mémoire sur la conquête de la Syrie (=Mémoires d’histoire et de géographie orientales, 2, 2nd edition)*, Leiden, 1900.
- Ḥabbāl, Ibrāhīm b. Sa’īd, *Wafayāt al-Miṣriyyin*, ed. Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaddād, Riyāḍ, 1408.
- HERMOSILLA LLISTERRI, M. J., «Una versión inédita del *Kitāb bad’ al-jalq wa-qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’* en el ms. LXIII de la Junta», *Al-Qantara VI* (1985), 43-77.
- al-Ḥusaynī, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *Al-ikmāl*, ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘tī Amīn Qal‘agī, Karachi, 1989.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Yūsuf b. ‘Abdallāh, *Al-isṭī‘āb fi ma‘rifat al-aṣḥāb*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, Beirut, 1412.
- Ibn al-‘Adīm, ‘Umar b. Aḥmad, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fi ta’riḫ Ḥalab*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1988.
- Ibn ‘Asākir, ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan, *Ta’riḫ madīnat Dimashq*, ed. ‘Umar b. Gharāma al-‘Amrawī, Beirut, 1995.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Al-iṣāba fi tamyiz al-ṣaḥāba*, Cairo, 1328.
- Idem*, *Lisān al-mizān*, Beirut, 1993.
- Idem*, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, Beirut, 1984.
- Ibn Ḥubaysh, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, *Ghazawāt Ibn Ḥubaysh*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1992.
- Ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī, *Fahrasat mā rawāhu ‘an shuyūkhīhi min al-dawāwīn fi ḍurūb al-‘ilm wa-anwā’ al-ma‘ārif*, ed. Francisco Codera and J. Ribera Tarragó, Saragossa, 1894-5.
- Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, ed. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Silafī, Riyāḍ, 1415.
- al-‘Ijlī, Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallāh, *Ma‘rifat al-thiqāt*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Alīm ‘Abd al-‘Azīm al-Bustawī, Medina, 1985.
- Kaḥḥāla, ‘Umar Riḍā, *Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifin, tarājim muṣannifī al-kutub al-‘arabiyya*, Beirut, 1993.
- LANDAU-TASSERON, E., «On the reconstruction of lost sources», in *History and Historiography in Early Islamic Times: Studies and perspectives*, ed. L. I. Conrad, Princeton (forthcoming).
- al-Mizzī, Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, ed. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf, Beirut, 1980.
- al-Qurashī, Ibn Abī al-Wafā’, *Al-jawāhir al-muḍī’a fi ṭabaqāt al-ḥanafīyya*, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥilw, Riyāḍ, 1978-88.
- SIVAN, E., *L’Islam et la Croisade*, Paris, 1968.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *Ta’riḫ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo, 1969.
- TERÉS SÁDABA, E., *Los Manuscritos Árabes de la Real Academia de la Historia: La «Colección Gayangos»*, discurso leído en el acto de su recepción pública, Madrid, 1975.
- ps. Wāqidi, *Futūḥ al-Shām*, ed. ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Beirut, 1997.

ABSTRACT

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

RESUMEN

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