“I’ll Not Accept Aid from a *mushrik*”

Rural Space, Persuasive Authority, and Religious Difference in Three Prophetic ḥadīths

Luke Yarbrough

How did *ideas* concerning rural space help early Muslim leaders to exercise their authority – whether by coercion or suasion – across the vast empires of the caliphs? This essay offers an answer to this question by studying three texts that were circulated within a loose, empire-wide network of Muslim religious authorities: the *ḥadīth* transmitters. These three texts are *ḥadīths* in which the Prophet forbids the recruitment of non-Muslim troops. By placing the incidents described in rural settings that implicitly limited the potential audience for the Prophet’s words, *ḥadīth* transmitters made proprietary claims to knowledge of the Prophet’s normative example. They also emphasized his stern resolve on the issue by having him reject non-Muslim military aid in a rural space that was by nature anomic. By using new methods for dating and mapping the transmission of *ḥadīths*, we can see more clearly how early Muslim authorities used ideas of rural space to assert a particular kind of prescriptive control, first in the city of Medina, then across the empire.

The dictum “I/We shall not accept aid from a *mushrik*”¹ transfixes three well-known Prophetic *ḥadīths* that are set on the rural periphery of Medina. In this dictum, the Prophet Muḥammad expresses a normative sentiment that would become widespread among jurists: non-Muslims should not be recruited to fight for Muslim causes alongside Muslim combatants.² Although they have

-
- 1 *lā/lan (n)astaʿīn bi-mushrik (/bil-mushrikīn ‘ala l-mushrikīn)*. The word *mushrik*, untranslated below, means someone whose monotheism is defective. Often taken to refer in the Qurʾān to Arab polytheists, it may actually have meant monotheists, whether pagans or Jews, who “believed in the same Biblical God as the messenger” and for whom “lesser beings, indiscriminately called gods and angels, functioned much like (dead) saints in later Islam and Christianity” (Patricia Crone, “The Religion of the Qurʾānic Pagans: God and the Lesser Deities,” *Arabica* 57, no. 2–3 (2010): 151–200). Numerous polemical passages show that during the first Islamic century it came to be applied, widely though unevenly, to non-Muslims of any stripe.
 - 2 Discussions of the issue, citing these and other *ḥadīth pro* and *contra*, are found in *fiqh* of

been studied only in passing,³ these *ḥadīths* are relevant to current debates about inclusion in the early Islamic state, specifically the question of who might fight for its causes.⁴ They have also served for the last thirteen centuries as important proof texts for the controverted view that Muslims should not ally with non-Muslims in warfare or, frequently, in any collaborative undertaking at all. Absent critical study of their origins and early development, however, they are of limited use to historians. The events they relate may or may not have occurred as described. The dictum may or may not have been widely known and observed among the Arabian conquerors during their initial expansion, which saw intensive and dynamic military contact with non-Muslims.

-
- various periods. Some other *ḥadīths* would indicate that the Prophet accepted the military aid of non-Muslims, monotheists and otherwise. See passages cited in Yohanan Friedmann, *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 36 f.; al-Shāfiʿī, *Kitāb al-Umm*, ed. M.Z. al-Najjār, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifā, 1973), 4:261, 7:342; Ibn Qudāma, *al-Mughnī* (Cairo: Hajar, 1986–), 13:97 ff.; Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Muḥallā* (Cairo: Idārat al-Ṭibāʿa al-Muniriya, 1929–1934), 7:334–335. See also Ibn al-Mundhir, *al-Awsaṭ fi l-sunan wa-l-ijmāʿ wa-l-ikhtilāf*, ed. Ş. Ḥaniḫ (Riyadh: Dār Ṭayba, 1999) 11:175–177; al-Taḥāwī, *Sharḥ Mushkil al-āthār*, ed. Sh. al-ʿArnaʿūṭ (Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1994), 6:407–419; al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli, *Muntahā l-maṭlab fi taḥqīq al-madḥhab* (Mashhad: al-Majmaʿ, 1991–2008), 14:72–74, 15:188 f.; al-Ṭurayqī, *al-Istīʿāna bi-ghayr al-muslimīn fi l-fiqh al-islāmī* (Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1989), 265 f.
- 3 Outside the Islamic tradition, one or more of the three is mentioned in Leone Caetani, *Annali dell'Islām* (Milan: Ulrico Hoepli, 1918), 8:380 f.; Majid Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1955), 84; Yohanan Friedmann, "The Attitude of the *Jam'iyyati 'Ulama-I Hind* to the Indian National Movement and the Establishment of Pakistan," in *Inventing Boundaries: Gender, Politics, and the Partition of India*, ed. Mushirul Hasan (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000), 157–177, n. 30; Friedmann, *Tolerance*, 36 f.; Antoine Fattal, *Le statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'islam*, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Dar al-Machreq, 1995), 233; Marco Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken und Prophetenbiographie: eine quellenkritische Analyse der Sira-Überlieferung zu Muḥammads Konflikt mit den Juden* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998), 251; Tilman Nagel, *Mohammed: Leben und Legende* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2008), 307; Gauthier H.A. Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 384; Andreas Görke and Gregor Schoeler, *Die Ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muḥammads: Das Korpus 'Urwa ibn az-Zubair* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2008), 101, 252, 254. A very important recent study of the issue is Wadād al-Qāḍī, "Non-Muslims in the Muslim Conquest Army in Early Islam," in *Christians and Others in the Umayyad State*, ed. A. Borrut and F. Donner (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2016), 83–128.
 - 4 Especially the thesis of Fred Donner that seventh-century proto-Islam was a confessionally plural, pietistic, monotheist "Believers' movement" (see his *Muhammad and the Believers: At the Origins of Islam* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010); "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community," *al-Abḥath* 50–51 (2002–2003): 9–53; *Narratives of Islamic Origins* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1998), 64–97). If the Prophet really did reject the military assistance of Jews, calling them *mushrikūn*, this sit poorly with Donner's thesis.

The dictum pins these *ḥadīths* not only to one another, but also to a common origin. It is singularly improbable that the same phrase should have originated independently in three different settings, thence finding its way to the climax of three independent *ḥadīths* that all happen to follow the same narrative arc. Thus the accounts must have emerged from a shared milieu wherein the slogan circulated and the three *ḥadīths* shared points of historical contact.

Two candidates for this milieu emerge. The first is, of course, the circle of Muḥammad and his Companions. He, or they, before they dispersed widely in the campaigns that followed his death, would have first uttered the dictum, and later generations recalled it. The second is a later locale in which the slogan circulated. Recognizing the three *ḥadīths* as narrative representations, I use their *isnāds* to date and locate the composition of their shared narrative schema in early second/eighth-century Medina.⁵ First, however, I discuss the significance of their contents in the Medinan setting, particularly that of their placement in an imagined Ḥijāzī hinterland. Finally, I attempt to lay the groundwork for use of the three *ḥadīths* as historical sources.

1 The *ḥadīths* and Their Use of Rural Space

The fourth/tenth-century Ḥanafī jurist al-Ṭahāwī presents versions of all three *ḥadīths*, as follows:⁶

1. The well armed squadron of Jews
 ‘Ubayd b. Rijāl – Hādīya b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb – al-Faḍl b. Mūsā al-Sīnānī – Muḥammad b. ‘Amr – Sa’d b. Mundhir al-Sā’idī – Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā’idī, who said: ‘The Prophet went out on the day of Uḥud, continuing until he had passed Thanīyat al-Wadā’.⁷ Suddenly there appeared a well-armed squadron (*katība khashnā*). He said, “Who are these?” They replied, “Banū

5 In this task, I take methodological cues from the work of Harald Motzki (e.g., “Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey,” *Arabica* 52, no. 2 (2005): 204–253) and Behnam Sadeghi (“The Traveling Tradition Test: A Method for Dating Traditions,” *Der Islam* 85, no. 1 (2010): 203–242).

6 al-Ṭahāwī, *Sharḥ*, 6:407–419. For biographical information on individual transmitters, including dates of death, see the Notes to Figures 2.1–2.3 in the Appendix to this essay.

7 A pass in the vicinity of Medina. There is disagreement as to whether it lay north or south of the city center; al-Samhūdī holds for north: al-Samhūdī, *Wafā’ al-Wafā bi-akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. Q. al-Sāmarrā’ī (London: Mu’assasat al-Furqān li-l-Turāth al-Islāmī, 2001), 4:195–201.

Qaynuqā', the tribe (*raḥṭ*) of 'Abd Allāh b. Salām,⁸ and the people (*qawm*) of 'Abd Allāh b. Ubayy b. Salūl."⁹ Then he said, "Convert [to Islam]!" But they refused. He said, "Say to them, 'Let them return, for we will not accept the aid of *mushrikūn* against *mushrikūn*.'"

2. The *mushrik* of Badr

Yūnus – Ibn Wahb – Mālik b. Anas – al-Fuḍayl b. Abī 'Abd Allāh – 'Abd Allāh b. Niyār al-Aslamī – 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr – 'Ā'isha, wife of the Prophet: The Apostle of God [*rasūl Allāh*, henceforth "the Prophet"] went out toward Badr. When he reached Ḥarrat al-Wabra,¹⁰ he met a certain man who was renowned for daring and valor. The Companions of the Prophet rejoiced when they saw him. When he met him, he said to the Prophet, "I have come to follow you and raid (*uṣība*) with you." The Prophet replied, "Do you believe in God ... and his Apostle?" He said, "No." [The Prophet] replied, "Then go back, for I will not accept aid from a *mushrik*." He said: Then he continued on until we were¹¹ at the tree.¹² There the man met him again, and spoke to him as he had the first time. The Prophet replied

- 8 A Jewish sage of Medina who recognized Muḥammad's prophethood. See Josef Horowitz, "Abd Allāh b. Salām," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0063.
- 9 A major figure in Muḥammad's Medina, the Khazrajite Ibn Ubayy (d. 9/631) is depicted as a halfhearted convert who, after Uḥud, became an increasingly bitter opponent and archetypical *munāfiq* ("hypocrite"). He is known to have had allies among the Banū Qaynuqā'. See W. Montgomery Watt, "Abd Allāh b. Ubayy b. Salūl," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0065.
- 10 Or "al-Wabara." This is the *ḥarra* (basalt lava flow) to the west of Medina, at a distance of about 6 km. (al-Samhūdī, *Wafā'*, 4: 236 f., where a version is quoted; Otto Loth, "Die Vulkanregionen (Ḥarra's) von Arabien nach Jākūt," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 22, no. 3 (1868): 380).
- 11 Who is the narrator here? 'Urwa was not yet alive at the time of these events, while 'Ā'isha is not known to have joined in the Badr expedition. Later commentators occasionally solve the problem by making the first person "we were" refer to the Muslims – 'Ā'isha identifies with them vicariously (see references in Notes to Figure 2.2). Other versions introduce this phrase with "She said" rather than "he said", and render "we were" in the third person.
- 12 This refers to an acacia tree in Dhū l-Ḥulayfa, a village south-west of Medina. Here was built a mosque, known as Masjid al-Shajara. The distance from the porch of this mosque to the door of the Prophet's mosque in Medina was evidently 19,732.5 hand cubits (9.8 km. at 1 hand cubit = 49.8 cm. (see Walther Hinz, "Dhirā," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1825), or 5 2/3 Arab miles less 100 cubits by al-Samhūdī's calculation, or 9.2 km. by modern satellite measurements). Here those making *hajj* from Medina entered *iḥrām* (i.e., it is the *miqāt* of Medina). In one version the location is given as Dhū l-Ḥulayfa itself (al-Samhūdī, *Wafā'*, 3:421–427, 4:246). This account thus takes us well outside of Medina into the surrounding countryside.

as he had before, saying, “No,” and adding, “Go back, for I will not accept aid from a *mushrik*.” But he returned, and met him at al-Baydā'.¹³ He said to him, as he had the first time, “Do you believe in God and his Apostle?” He replied, “Yes.” Then the Prophet said, “Then come along (*fa-nṭaliq*).”

3. The rejection of Khubayb

Ḥusayn b. Naṣr – Yazīd b. Hārūn – Mustalim b. Sa'īd – Khubayb b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Khubayb – his father – his grandfather, who said: “I came to the Prophet before one of his raids, in the company of a man from my tribe [*qawm*]; we had not become Muslims. We said, ‘We are ashamed that our tribe should go to war [*an yashhada qawmunā mashhadan*] without us.’ [The Prophet] said, ‘Have you become Muslims?’ We said, ‘No.’ He replied, ‘We will not accept the aid of *mushrikūn* against *mushrikūn*.’”

In most versions, Khubayb and his companion responds to this rejection by converting.

Before taking a closer look at the texts of the three *ḥadīths*, it is worth noting two historical points of obvious significance. The first is that the questions that are raised and answered in these *ḥadīths* – questions concerning military recruitment and communal belonging, whether tribal or monotheistic – were existential ones for the Islamic state in its first century. All three *ḥadīths* posit, for example, a declaration of faith and allegiance as a prerequisite for military participation on the Muslims' behalf. In the first and third *ḥadīths*, this requirement is overlaid on a background of tribal affiliation. This implies that belonging to a certain tribe matters less than belonging to Islam when it comes to participation in warfare. The overlapping and sometimes conflicting claims of tribal and religious affiliation were also central to the Constitution of Medina.¹⁴ Indeed, for a movement (the so-called “jihad state”) that was intent on conquering the Late Antique Near East, where political boundaries shadowed religious ones, the question of how religious difference affected the possibility of military cooperation was of perennial urgency. It is well known that non-Muslims frequently fought alongside the Arabian conquerors.¹⁵ Such coopera-

13 An elevation immediately above Dhū l-Ḥulayfa to the west (al-Samhūdī, *Wafā'*, 4:176–178).

14 On the Constitution of Medina, an agreement to which Jews are party and in which mutual support in conflicts is also of central importance, see most recently Michael Lecker, *The Constitution of Medina: Muḥammad's First Legal Document* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2004).

15 In the juristic literature the classic case is the Meccan Ṣafwān b. Umayya (d. ca. 41/61), who took part in the Battle of Ḥunayn on the Muslims' side before his conversion and with Muḥammad's evident sanction. See also al-Qāḍī, “Non-Muslims,” *passim*.

tion was probably even more commonplace than our sources indicate. It seems that conversion was not strictly necessary in order for an individual to become a *mawlā* or "client" of an Arab tribe, the primary avenue to inclusion in the early Islamic community.¹⁶ The three *ḥadīths* thus represent a firm normative position that would make religious alterity a barrier to military cooperation. This position became increasingly dominant in the Islamic juristic tradition. The *ḥadīths* are thus significant both because they intersect major religious and political trends of the first two Islamic centuries and because they lie at the head of a restrictive legal tradition that has cast a long shadow.

The second point to note – and the crucial one for this volume – is that the three *ḥadīths* are all set on the rural periphery of Medina. All three represent the delivery of the dictum as occurring after a physical movement from urban to rural space. Why? Whatever one thinks about the events' historicity, they need not have been represented in this way.¹⁷ I would argue that the rural setting reflects a Medinan rhetorical appropriation of rural space for the purpose of asserting normative authority. As will be shown below, these *ḥadīths* represent a Medinan viewpoint as it existed in that city in the early second/eighth century. They offer us a glimpse of a strain of control that was exercised by *ḥadīth* transmitters by means of imagined, rhetorical rural space.

To appreciate how imagined rural space could discharge this function, one ought to begin by noting that in early Islam, authority belonged to God, as the Qur'an implies by the phrase *al-ḥukm li-lāh* ("Rule is God's," e.g., 12:40, 67, etc.). In principle, God conferred political authority on Muḥammad and his successors the caliphs or imams, whoever they should rightfully have been. How that authority was parlayed into control – coercive or otherwise – soon came under scrutiny from another quarter: that of the scholars, among them the *ḥadīth* transmitters. These last sought to leverage Muḥammad's authority for causes they cared about by claiming proprietary knowledge of his paradigmatic *vita*, as conveyed in the *ḥadīth*.

16 On non-Muslim *mawālī*, see, e.g., Sobhi Bouderbala, "Les mawālī à Fustāt aux deux premiers siècles de l'Islam et leur intégration sociale," in *Les dynamiques d'islamisation en Méditerranée centrale et en Sicile: Nouvelles propositions et découvertes récentes*, eds. A. Nef and F. Ardizzone (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2014), 103–117 (I owe this reference to Marie Legendre); Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 237, n. 358.

17 The etiology of representation was not an issue that engrossed *ḥadīth* critics, and is thus somewhat exogenous to their discourse. For *ḥadīth* as "fictional" narrative discourse, see Sebastian Günther, "Fictional Narration and Imagination within an Authoritative Framework," in *Story-telling in the Framework of Non-fictional Arabic Literature*, ed. S. Leder (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998), 433–471; Daniel Beaumont, "Hard-Boiled: Narrative Discourse in Early Muslim Traditions," *Studia Islamica* 83 (1996): 5–31.

Imagined rural space played a strategic dual role in facilitating this project with respect to our three *ḥadīths*. In all three, Muḥammad “went out” from Medina, placing the events that follow beyond the view of all but his traveling companions. The *exeunt* fortified claims to proprietary knowledge of what he proceeded to do and say. Moses received the Law alone on a mountain. Jesus of Nazareth retired to lonely places to teach his disciples. Muḥammad himself received early revelations alone in a cave. Similarly, the well-armed squadron proffered its services at the appropriately obscure Thanīyat al-Wadāʾ, not at the mosque in Medina. Jesus’ own principled rejections of would-be followers took place after he and his disciples had left a village, “as they went in the way” (Luke 9:56–62). An effect of setting such events in rural space was to circumscribe debate about what had taken place there.¹⁸ Eighth-century *ḥadīth* transmitters were a mainly urban group, but in the Prophet’s countryside that they imagined their political authority was amplified precisely because his policy statements *in rure* were spoken into empty space. True, those who accompanied Muḥammad at Badr and Uḥud included his most prominent Companions. This is why it is so striking that they should be marginal and anonymous in the three *ḥadīths*, in which their names are overlooked in favor of such obscure toponyms as Ḥarrat al-Wabra and al-Baydāʾ, the spatial transition among which opens rhetorical space for repetition and reinforcement of the dictum.

If the transmitters’ authority waxed in this way, it did so at the expense of the Prophet’s coercive control. Rejecting the aid of warlike *mushrikūn* not only deprived the Prophet’s forces of their aid, but left them roaming the hinterlands of Medina. Here the limits of state control over rural space are not only highly visible, but rhetorically advantageous. Beyond those limits lies contested space where state agents face choices unimaginable within or before city walls. Representation reflects experience; indeed, it relies on accurate reflection for its normative power.¹⁹ Pre-modern urban space, like the rural battlefield, had a

18 Another effect of movement into rural space may have been to evoke the standard itinerary of the Late Antique “holy man,” who acquired authority at a remove from human society and exercised it upon his return. The classic study of the holy man in the late antique Syrian countryside is Peter Brown, “The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101. For a more recent adaptation of Brown’s paradigm in a rural setting, see Ariel Lopez, *Shenoute of Atripe and the Uses of Poverty* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2013), 95.

19 Cf. Günther, “Fictional Narration,” 469: “By means of arranging – and fictionalising – the elements of the world of experience of a former ‘ideal’ generation ..., the recipient is left to himself to draw his conclusions and lessons from the happenings recounted. The allegory inherent in these *ḥadīths* establishes, in fact, an exemplary connection between one sphere of existence ... and others.”

binarizing effect on military forces, concentrating or dissolving armies as discrete units. At cities, armies form up, attack, defend, loot, or are routed. They break or are broken. To garrison troops in a city creates instability, as residents of al-Mu'taṣim's Baghdad or al-Mustanṣir's Cairo might testify. Partly for this reason, the early Muslims established the *amṣār* – garrison cities – away from existing population centers. In a garrison city, matters are of course different, and if these accounts had been formulated among the *jabbānas* of Kūfa – open urban spaces where the resident tribal fighters gathered and dispersed – rather than in Medina, the *exeunt* might have been superfluous.

Arid and semi-arid hinterlands, by contrast, when not playing host to the temporary conurbations of combat, were zones of military transition, where fighting men were raised and recruited, and where armies break camp for the march and disperse to requisition. Group agency and identity is diluted in the dust of the road, and the flanks exposed. Dilution, in turn, facilitates change in the vectors and composition of the army. It is no surprise, then, that Muḥammad should be depicted sealing the religious boundaries of his military forces in this anomic setting, where group boundaries were most permeable.²⁰

The setting, in fact, throws the dictum into sharp relief; if space for inter-religious cooperation were to be found anywhere, then surely it would have been here, in the transitional countryside, and now, on the verges of Muḥammad's most improbable triumph (Badr) and his most bitter defeat (Uḥud). That no such space was made lent authority to the transmitters' controverted views about the religious modalities of legitimate state control. In a sense, they harvested rhetorical authority for themselves from the excluded *mushrikūn*, the undermanned army of Muḥammad, and the non-*cognoscenti* among their colleagues, in the fertile landscape of an imagined Ḥijāzī hinterland.

20 On military organization and recruitment in Arabia and in early Islam, see Hugh Kennedy, *The Armies of the Caliphs: Military and Society in the Early Islamic State* (London: Routledge, 2001); Patricia Crone, "The Early Islamic World," in *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, The Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, ed. K. Raaflaub and N. Rosenstein (Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1999), 309–332 (non-Muslim participation discussed at 314); Ella Landau-Tasseron, "Features in the Pre-Conquest Muslim Army in the Time of Muḥammad," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, vol. 3, *States, Resources, and Armies*, ed. A. Cameron (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1995), 299–336; J.W. Jandora, "Developments in Islamic Warfare: The Early Conquests," *Studia Islamica* 64 (1986): 101–113 (non-Muslim fighters mentioned at 109, 112).

2 The Milieu of Early Circulation

It remains, however, to show that the three *ḥadīths* in question did, in fact, originate in Medina, and to consider the question of the dates at which they were composed. The following schemata and accompanying tables present the putative paths along which each *ḥadīth* was transmitted, according to the testimony of the sources, as well as the overlap between shared paths of transmission and shared contents.

Key to Figures 2.1–2.3

A solid arrow denotes a source attribution in an *isnād*. No distinction is made among the various types of attribution (*ḥaddathanā*, *akhbaranā*, *ʿan*, etc.).

A dotted arrow denotes a defective source attribution in an *isnād*. This arises when an authority cites a source from whom he cannot possibly have heard the material in question. This does not imply dishonesty on the part of this authority, but merely inexhaustive citation.

A name surrounded by a box denotes a printed work in which a given *ḥadīth* is to be found. The name belongs to the compiler to whom the work is attributed.

Mūsā b. Hārūn

A name not surrounded by a box denotes a transmitter credited as the proximate source of a given *ḥadīth*.

A circle containing a letter or letters and placed on an arrow denotes the city in which the transmission that the arrow signifies is likely to have taken place. This is usually but not always determined by the place where the earlier transmitter is known to have settled at a mature age, i.e., at the time when he would have transmitted to others most actively. Where no circle appears, the *ḥadīth* did not “travel” to a new city, but instead “stayed” in the city of the previous transmission. A blank circle indicates that the place of transmission is uncertain, but probably not identical with that of the previous transmission. Letters represent places as follows: **Bg** = Baghdād; **Bl** = Balkh; **Bṣ** = Baṣra; **D** = Damas-

Key to Figures 2.1–2.3 (cont.)

cus; E = Egypt; K = Kūfa; If = Isfarāyin; Iṣ = Iṣbahān; Ğğ = Jurjān; Md = Medina; Mn = al-Madā’in; Mv = Marw; Nā = Nasā; Ns = Naysābūr; R = Rayy; Sq = Samarqand; W = Wāsiṭ

Key to Tables 2.1–2.3

Columns	Columns are headed with textual features that serve to distinguish versions from one another.
Rows	Rows are labeled with the name of the compiler, with one row for each discrete version. In order to reduce clutter, no effort is made to distinguish multiple versions found in a single compilation.
Dark bars	Row-label cells are joined by dark bars to indicate that they share a unique transmitter or transmitters ...
	... In Table 2.1, extra-thick dark bars serve precisely the same function (the thickness distinguishes them from adjacent dark bars). In Table 2.2, the transmitters directly from the common link (found in column 1) act in the same way, with additional dark bars indicating further connections above this generation of transmitters.

FIGURE 2.1 A well-armed squadron of Jews

TABLE 2.1

	Uḥūd	600 Jews	‘Abdallāh b. Salām mentioned	Ibn Ubayy on site	B. Qaynuqā’ mentioned	The Prophet and conversion		Dictum
						Question	Command	
Bayhaqī			×	not mentioned	×	×		×
al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī			×	not mentioned	×	×		×
Ḥiṣām b. ‘Ammār	×			×		×		×
Ibn Abī Shayba	×			×		×		×
Ibn Sa‘d	×	×	×	×	×	×		×
Ṭabarānī	×	×		×	×	×		×
Ḥāzimi	×	×		×	×	×		×
Ibn al-Mundhir	×		×	×	×	×		×
Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim	×		×		×	×		×
Ṭaḥāwī	×		×		×		×	×

TABLE 2.2 The *mushrik* of Badr

		Ḥarrat al-Wabra	al-Shajara	al-Bayḍāʾ	Speech upon volunteering	Order to return	1st – prsn.	<i>astaʿīn</i>	<i>nastaʿīn</i>	Closing line
Maʿn	Ibn Saʿd	×	×	×	<i>li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...</i>	×			×	<i>fa-ṭāliq</i>
	Tirmidhī ²¹	×				×		mss differ		(no conversion)
Ibn Wahb	Ṣaḥnūn	×	×	×	<i>li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...</i>	×		×	(<i>lan</i>)	<i>fa-ṭāliq</i>
	Ibn al-Mundhir	×	×	×	<i>li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...</i>	×	×	×	(<i>lan</i>)	<i>fa-ṭāliq</i>
	al-Bayhaqī	×	×	×	<i>li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...</i>	×		×	(<i>lan</i>)	<i>fa-ṭāliq</i>
	Abū ʿAwāna	×	×	×	<i>li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...</i>	×		×	(<i>lan</i>)	
Abū ʿAwāna								no <i>matn</i> given		

21 Tirmidhī notes that “there is more to the *ḥadīṭ* than this”, making his version a poor candidate for *matn* comparison.

TABLE 2.2 The *mushrik* of Badr (cont.)

		Ḥarrat al-Wabra	al-Shajara	al-Bayḍā'	Speech upon volunteering	Order to return	1st – prsn.	asta ʿīn	nasta ʿīn	Closing line
	Ṭaḥāwī	×	×	×	li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...	×	×		× (lan)	fa-ṇṭaliq
	Muslim	×	×	×	li-attabiʿaka wa-uṣība ...	×	×	× (lan)		fa-ṇṭaliq
Biṣr	Ibn Jarūd	Badr only toponym mentioned			akhruju maʿaka?				× (lā)	(no conversion)
	Abū ʿAwāna	no <i>matn</i> given								
Ibn Saʿīd	Ṭaḥāwī	Badr only toponym mentioned			akhruju maʿaka?				× (lā)	(no conversion)
	Abū Dāʿūd	No toponym mentioned				×			× (lā)	(no conversion)
	Dāraqutnī ²²	No toponym mentioned			akūna ... wa- uṣība ...				× (lā)	wa-ṇṭalaqa maʿahu

22 This version and the following show truncated, non-specific knowledge of long version.

TABLE 2.2 The *mushrik* of Badr (cont.)

	Ḥarrat al-Wabra	al-Shajara	al-Bayda’	Speech upon volunteering	Order to return	1st – prsn.	asta’in	nasta’in	Closing line
	Nasā’ī	No toponym mentioned		li-akūna ... wa-uṣība ...				× (lā)	fa-ntalaqa ma’ahu
Ibn Maḥdī	Nasā’ī			dictum only				× (lan)	(no conversion)
	Ibn Ḥanbal	×	×	li-attabi’aka wa-uṣība ...	×			× (lan)	fa-kharaja bihi
	Ṭaḥāwī	No toponym mentioned			×			×	(no conversion)
	Muslim			no matn given				×	(no conversion)
Wakīf	Ibn Ḥibbān	No toponym mentioned			×			×	(no conversion)
	Dārimī			dictum only				×	(no conversion)
	Nasā’ī			dictum only				×	(no conversion)
	Ibn Rāḥawayh			dictum only				×	(no conversion)
	Ibn Ḥanbal	dictum only (‘Abdallāh supplies, without isnād, the above version from Ibn Ḥanbal to supplement)						×	(no conversion)

TABLE 2.2 The *muṣṣrik* of Badr (*cont.*)

		Ḥarrat al-Wābra	al-Shajara	al-Bayḏā'	Speech upon volunteering	Order to return	1st – prsn.	<i>asta'in</i>	<i>nasta'in</i>	Closing line	
Unique	Ibn Abī Shayba				dictum only						(no conversion)
	Ibn Māja				dictum only						(no conversion)
	Nasā'ī	×	×	×	<i>li-attabī'aka wa-uṣṣiba ...</i>	×	×	×	(<i>lān</i>)	<i>fa-nīṭaliq</i>	
	Jahḍamī	×	×	×	<i>li-ubāyī'aka wa-uṣṣiba ...</i>	×		×	(<i>lan</i>)	<i>fa-nīṭaliq</i>	
	Ibn Ḥanbal	No toponym mentioned			<i>attabī'aka li- uṣṣiba ...</i>					<i>fa-nīṭalaqa fa-tabi'ahu</i>	
no <i>matn</i> given, described only as longer than the other Dārimī version											
Ṭaḥāwī	×	×	(<i>Dhu l-Hulayfa</i>)	×	<i>abḥruju mā'aka fa-uqātilu wa- uṣṣibu</i>	×			×	(<i>lan</i>)	<i>fa-na'am idhan</i>
Ibn 'Adī										<i>lā tasta'inū</i>

FIGURE 2.3 The rejection of Khubayb

TABLE 2.3 The rejection of Khubayb

	Prior Islam denied	Objective	Dictum		Conversion	Battle deeds, domestic aftermath
			simple	"against <i>mushrikūn</i> "		
al-Ṭabarānī	×			×	×	
Abū Nu'aym	×			×	×	×
al-Ṭabarānī			×			
al-Ṭabarānī (2 <i>isnāds</i>)		<i>wajh</i>	×		×	×
Ibn Abī Shayba		<i>wajh</i>		×	×	
al-Bukhārī		<i>wajh</i>		×	×	
Ibn Abī Khaythama				×		
Ibn Sa'd	×	<i>ghazw</i>		×	×	×
al-Ḥākim	×	<i>ba'd ghazawātih</i>		×	×	×
al-Bayhaqī	×	<i>ba'd ghazawātih</i>		×	×	×
Baḥshal	×	<i>ba'd maghāzih</i>		×	×	
Abū Nu'aym (2 <i>isnāds</i>)	×	<i>ghazw</i>	×		×	×
Ibn Ḥanbal	×	<i>ghazw</i>		×	×	×
al-Rūyānī	×	<i>ba'd ghazawātih</i>		×	×	×
al-Khaṭīb	×	<i>ghazw</i>		×	×	×
al-Ṭaḥāwī	×	<i>ghazw</i>		×		
al-Ṭaḥāwī	no <i>matn</i> given					

(For Notes to Figures 2.1–2.3, please see the Appendix)

The "Travelling Tradition Test" (TT Test), recently formulated by Behnam Sadeghi, is a useful tool for dating *ḥadīths* that share a common feature. It uses geographic clustering of wording, themes, or legal positions to put bounds on the dates of traditions that purportedly moved from one city to another. If an idea, word, phrase, or some other feature is thereby uniquely linked to a city, its presence in a tradition of uncertain provenance can be used to assign the tradition to that city. The report can be dated approximately to the time interval spanned by the transmitters hailing from the tradition's city of origin.²³

The TT Test requires that "candidate birthplaces" ("the first city in which a prototype containing the shared features of the traditions ... circulated") be identified for each of a cluster of traditions sharing a common feature. In the present case, the common feature comprises variations on the dictum – "I'll not accept aid from a *mushrik*" – in close combination with the distinctive narrative sequence in which it is embedded: 1. exit from Medina into rural space; 2. encounter with warlike non-Muslim(s); 3. dictum; 4. conversion. In some versions one or more of these components is omitted, while in others there is additional material. Never, however, is one of these components replaced with an incompatible alternative. In principle, the dictum might have been deployed in a wide variety of alternative narrative sequences, but in fact it was not.

What, then, are the candidate birthplaces of each of these three *ḥadīths*? The candidate birthplaces are determined on the basis of the cities in which each *ḥadīth* was known to circulate during its early transmission history, based upon the names of the transmitters and information known about their lives. (For what next follows, see Figures 2.1–2.3.) Thus for the squadron of Jews, the candidate birthplaces are Medina and, if one chooses to treat the *isnāds* bypassing the later potential "common link" (al-Faḍl b. Mūsā) as Juynbollian "dives," a choice that I will argue on textual grounds to be unwise,²⁴ Marw.²⁵ For the

23 Sadeghi, "Traveling Tradition Test," 203–204.

24 For the term "dives" – spurious *isnāds* "launched" in order to bypass a transmitter's real source, ascribing a given *ḥadīth* to an earlier, false source – see Juynboll, *Encyclopaedia*, xxiii ff.; cf. Motzki, "Dating," 229 f.

25 Since three of the four transmitters from the earlier "common link" are from Iraq, an Iraqi birthplace is theoretically possible. However, the fact that one transmitter is Baṣran and two Kūfan (one of whom settled in Damascus and is seen narrating this *ḥadīth* only to a confirmed Damascene), while another is Marwazī, makes this possibility remote. It requires one transmitter to have fabricated the *ḥadīth*, falsely ascribing it to Muḥammad

mushrik of Badr, Medina is the only viable candidate birthplace. For the rejection of Khubayb, Wāsiṭ and Medina are both candidate birthplaces.

The TT Test yields Medina as the only candidate birthplace common to all three *ḥadīths*. The *isnāds* thus give these *ḥadīths* the appearance of regionalism (“geographic clustering of contents”).²⁶ But why should we believe that *isnāds* carry historical information about the actual paths, human and thus geographical, along which the *ḥadīths* were disseminated? Sadeghi argues persuasively that “*isnāds* often carry valid geographical information.” Supposing that “unity of distinctive contents implies unity of origin,” if *isnāds* do not carry valid geographical information then there is no reason that the *isnāds* of *ḥadīth* that share features should habitually give the appearance of regionalism. Yet they often do so, suggesting that the geographical information conveyed in the *isnāds* is valid. Put differently, the regular concurrence of common features with common milieus is unlikely to be due to chance, and common geographical origin “usually provides the most plausible explanation” for this concurrence.²⁷

These formulations apply to the present case, and point to a Medinan origin for all three *ḥadīths*. They arise from a single insight about *ḥadīths*: shared distinctive contents tend to go along with shared geographical paths of transmission. I would propose a minor refinement to Sadeghi’s formulation, based on our case: there *is* reason for the appearance of regionalism to come about even if the *isnāds* are wholly fictitious in cases where the *ḥadīths* in question narrate events that happen in a certain place. This is because of the natural presumption that residents of a certain place are most likely to have knowledge of events that occurred there. We might say of a shared feature that the more geographically specific it is, the less confident we may be that the appearance of regionalism arises from a historical transmission process. This assumes that the place mentioned corresponds to the place of the observed regionalism; if the places differ, we may be relatively more confident that the appearance of regionalism reflects reality. Thus one can readily imagine a motive for spuriously attributing each of our three *ḥadīths* to early Medinan transmitters.²⁸

b. ‘Amr, and the other three to have unanimously falsified the actual source of their information.

26 Sadeghi, “Travelling Tradition Test,” 204.

27 Sadeghi, “Travelling Tradition Test,” 205 f.

28 Another observation concerning the TT Test is that the “reality of regionalism” is obscured as well as proved by the fact that cities developed distinctive positions on certain issues that could themselves be distinctive. As a rule of thumb, the more idiosyncratic or peculiar an issue on which authorities in different cities held apparently regionally distinct

This refinement recognizes that transmitters of any *ḥadīth* relating events that occurred near Medina, or any given city, might want to cite the authorities of that city. It does not explain how certain clusters of *ḥadīths*, including the three at hand, came to have related *non-region-specific* contents as well (in this case, the shared narrative structure and dictum). Moreover, it is undermined by the fact that many *ḥadīths* about events that occurred in Medina were attributed to Arabs who settled in Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere very early in the Islamic period. Nevertheless, it will be well to test the reliability of these *isnāds* in another way, using not only principles that apply to any cluster of textually related *ḥadīths*, but also the data for these particular *ḥadīths*. A further reason for such an independent test is that we have only three related *ḥadīths* that converge on Medina – not an unusual number for that city, as Sadeghi points out, and thus not a sure indicator that that dictum was peculiar to it. However, one might here invoke Sadeghi's own caveat: "shared distinctive features can significantly strengthen the likelihood of shared origins even for a small number of traditions."²⁹ The dictum in combination with its associated narrative sequence is distinctive to these three *ḥadīths*.

We possess an independent test of the *isnāds'* integrity in *matn-cum-isnād* analysis: comparison of the contents of the different versions of a certain *ḥadīth*, with attention to the putative routes of transmission found in their *isnāds*. *Matn-cum-isnād* analyses of the three *ḥadīths* that contain variations on the dictum "I will not accept aid from a *mushrik*" strongly suggest that their *isnāds* give historically valid information about the human and thus geographical paths along which they were disseminated.

For what follows, refer to Tables 2.1–2.3. The suggestion of the *isnāds'* historical validity is strong because in numerous cases, versions whose *isnāds* claim for them a shared path of transmission tend to share specific features or combinations of features. For example, in Table 2.2, the six versions of the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr whose *isnāds* claim that they were transmitted from Mālik, the "common link," by Waki' b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/812) contain only the dictum. The six versions allegedly via Ibn Wahb (d. 197/813) all give a much more elaborate narrative, in which the phrase by which the *mushrik* attempts to enlist is virtually identical. Only the two versions that pass via Bishr

positions happens to be, the less confident we may be that these positions were actually regionally distinct, since the very commonality of preoccupation erodes the assumed separation on which regionalism is predicated. So for Sadeghi's "idealized sample" ("Traveling Tradition Test," 208–209), one's confidence in the results depends on the perceived idiosyncrasy of the issue on which Meccan and Baṣran authorities differed.

29 Sadeghi, "Traveling Tradition Test," 209.

(d. 207/822) mention, of toponyms, only Badr, while only versions via Yahyā b. Saʿīd (d. 198/813) include the verbal form *akūnu/akūna* in the *mushrik*'s enlistment pitch. Other similarities may be observed in Table 2.2.

Analogous patterns are observed for the other two *ḥadīths*. In the case of the rejection of Khubayb (Table 2.3), for example, there is a perfect correlation between the four shared paths of transmission and the respective words used to designate the objective of Muḥammad's expedition. In the case of the well-armed squadron of Jews (Table 2.1), only three versions give the number of Jews (600): the two that were allegedly transmitted from al-Faḍl b. Mūsā by Khālīd b. Khidāsh, and a third version that, although it does not claim to have been transmitted by Khālīd, was allegedly transmitted by al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971), who also transmitted a version from Khālīd. More arresting is the correspondence between the two versions that are unique not in sharing but in lacking a certain transmitter; the only two versions that do not claim to have passed via al-Faḍl b. Mūsā in Marw also happen to be the only two versions ignorant of the "fact" that the Jews were of Banū Qaynuqā', a detail that creates chronological difficulties that are discussed below. This coincidence suggests that the Medinan Muḥammad b. 'Amr (d. 144–145/761), or a Medinan near contemporary of his, actually transmitted a proto-version of this *ḥadīth*, and that he did not (or at least did not always) mention the Jews' tribal affiliation. A similar though less striking example of this phenomenon may be observed in the case of the rejection of Khubayb, where only one version consists of the naked dictum: that which "dives" beneath Yazīd b. Hārūn (d. 117/735) to his putative source, Mustalim b. Saʿīd (d. ?). The most persuasive account of all this evidence is that the concurrences were in fact produced by the transmission process that the *isnāds* indicate to have taken place, in more or less the way they depict it.

Matn-cum-isnād analysis' strong suggestion that these *isnāds* convey historically valid information remains a suggestion rather than a demonstrated proposition because the correlation between shared putative paths of transmission and shared content is imperfect. There are of course minor, random differences in the contents of *ḥadīths* allegedly transmitted by common routes – this is expected because the common routes are usually only partial, leaving room for non-shared transmitters, including the named compilers themselves or their students, to have introduced modifications. More problematic are cases where there is a strong correlation between the contents of versions that do not claim to share routes of transmission after the common link, or where there is little correlation between the contents of versions that do claim to share routes of transmission. For an example of the first scenario, in the case of the rejection of Khubayb, one can easily explain why the ver-

sion of al-Ṭabarānī that allegedly came to him via Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849) should use the same distinctive, unforeseeable word for Muḥammad's objective – *wajh* – as the version found in the latter transmitter's *Muṣannaḥ*. It is less easy to explain why one and only one other version – that of al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) – should use the same word, when it allegedly came via an independent route. For an example of the second scenario, relating to the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr, one version cited by Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 240/855) gives the longer narrative, while the two other versions from Ibn Ḥanbal's putative source for this version (Ibn Maḥdī, d. 198/814) that are found in other compilations correspond quite closely to one another and show no knowledge of the longer narrative.

There are two plausible, overlapping explanations for this phenomenon. The first is borrowing or influence of *matn* material that the *isnāds* do not reflect. Thus al-Bukhārī's source, 'Abd Allāh al-Ju'fī (d. 229/844), might have heard a version that used the term *wajh* from someone other than Yazīd b. Hārūn, but narrated the *ḥadīth* as though he had heard it straight from Yazīd (he might of course really have heard a version from Yazīd, but been influenced by a version he heard elsewhere). Or, Ibn Ḥanbal's source for the longer version of the *ḥadīth*, Ibn Maḥdī, might have heard the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr from someone familiar with the elaborate version, but ascribed his transmission straight to Mālik (d. 179/796). The second explanation for unexpected concurrence of contents is variation in the wording of versions that a single person transmitted at different times. Thus Mālik might have transmitted different versions of the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr at different times, and Ibn Maḥdī and Ibn Wahb might have heard the same version from him on the same occasion, while Wakī' (for example) might have heard from Mālik only the dictum. Then, Ibn Maḥdī, having heard the long version from Mālik, might have at times transmitted it in full, and at times transmitted the abbreviated version that other collectors claim to have from him. The second explanation accounts not only for unexpected correlation, but also for some portion of the observed variation. Combinations of these two phenomena undoubtedly operated in the transmission history of these and most other *ḥadīths*. This fact erodes but does not efface the strong impression made by the *matn-cum-isnād* analyses: that the *isnāds* of these *ḥadīths* contain historically accurate human and thus geographical information.

The "single-strand" portion of the *isnāds* below (in Figures 2.1–2.3) the "common links" is immune to *matn-cum-isnād* analysis. Here Sadeghi's TT Test is most helpful. The TT Test indicates that the common portion of the three *ḥadīths*, comprising dictum and closely associated narrative sequence, originated in Medina. This indication has implications for dating that are in line

with views advanced by Harald Motzki.³⁰ Specifically, two of the *ḥadīths* should be assigned to a period earlier than the common-link phenomenon might lead one to believe on the Schachtian assumption that the common link of a *ḥadīth* was usually responsible for bringing it into circulation and attaching to it a fictitious *isnād*.³¹ According to the TT Test, a prototype account of the squadron of Jews predates al-Faḍl b. Mūsā (d. 192/807) and originated in Medina. Thus it may well have been narrated by the earlier common-link candidate, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, the latest Medinan transmitter in the stemma. A prototype account of the rejection of Khubayb b. Yisāf would really have been narrated by a Medinan transmitter before Mustalim, perhaps even by Khubayb b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 132/749), who is the latest Medinan in the stemma. It would not have been invented two generations later in Wāsiṭ, as a Schachtian reader of the stemma (Figure 2.3) might conclude.

The combination of the TT Test and *matn-cum-isnād* analysis yields the probable conclusion that a proto-account embedding the dictum in this distinctive narrative sequence first circulated in Medina, and is to be dated before the death of the earliest last Medinan transmitter in any of the three stemmata: Khubayb b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 132/749). In my view, this is the only plausible account of how the three *ḥadīths* came to share distinctive contents. To appreciate the significance of the stemmata found in Figures 2.1–2.3, consider a counterfactual. If all three *ḥadīths* had the same two candidate birthplaces (say, Medina and Baṣra), it would be impossible to determine whether the shared contents indicated a Medinan or Baṣran birthplace. In fact, however, the *ḥadīth* about the squadron of Jews allegedly moved diffusely from Medina to Kūfa, Damascus, and Marw, that about the *mushrik* of Badr must have been transmitted by the Medinan Mālik, and that about the rejection of Khubayb moved only to Wāsiṭ. It is of course possible to conceive of scenarios in which parts of one or two of the *ḥadīths* originated somewhere other than Medina. These are of low probability, however, and will not be detailed here. Furthermore, the most plausible of these low-probability alternative scenarios require the import of information from Medina – the names of transmitters, the dictum, etc. – along paths that must have closely resembled those we already have. Even

30 For Motzki, the common links observed in the *isnād* stemmata are not necessarily the originators but “the first major collectors and professional disseminators of knowledge in general, and of traditions about individuals of the first Islamic century in particular” (“Dating,” 228).

31 For a synopsis of Schacht’s position, see Motzki, “Dating,” 219 f. Similar assumptions animated the scholarship of Gauthier H.A. Juynboll (see, e.g., *Encyclopedia*, xxviii, col. 1). For a succinct critique of Juynboll’s method, see the review by Jonathan Brown (*Journal of Islamic Studies* 19, no. 3 (2008): 391–397).

if they were somehow to prove true, these alternative explanations would have little effect on the notion that the dictum and associated narrative sequence is of Medinan origin.

3 Early Muslim View on the Recruitment of Non-Muslim Troops

There is thus no evidence to indicate that Muslims possessed widely shared, principled reasons not to recruit non-Muslims in warfare during the main period of the conquests, roughly coinciding with the pre-Abbasid period. This conclusion is the product of a syllogism. The major premise is that all of the versions of these three *ḥadīths*, cited from numerous compilations, whose origins reach from Egypt to Transoxania, contain reports with *isnāds* that converge on pre-Abbasid Medina. Given the general reliability of their *isnāds* postdating this convergence, as established above, these *ḥadīths*, with the prophetic dictum they bear, are unlikely to have circulated widely beyond Medina before the Abbasid period. The minor premise is that in numerous juristic discussions of even greater geographic, temporal, and sectarian diversity, such as those cited in note 2 above, one finds no widely shared, principled reasons against allying with non-Muslims in warfare apart from these three *ḥadīth*. These juristic discussions may be considered reliable weirs, set in the current of the tradition that bore with it the available, principled rationales against recruiting non-Muslims. Now, if principled Islamic rationales for this view are restricted to these three *ḥadīths*, and if these three *ḥadīths* were restricted to Medina in pre-Abbasid times, then principled Islamic rationales against recruiting non-Muslims were restricted to Medina in pre-Abbasid times. The conquering Arabs may of course have had a range of reasons to refuse aid from willing, warlike infidels, from tactical to tribal. But these reasons are unlikely to have been widely shared, or to have been overtly Islamic in character. This conclusion highlights the significance of the geographical concurrence of these *isnāds*; if they had travelled along independent routes in diverse locales (say, Medina, Baṣra, and Ḥims) during the first century, it might be argued that they were widely known among the Arabs, perhaps because they reflected a shared memory of Muḥammad's policy. Since this is not the case, the reverse holds true.

Of course, this conclusion is not apodeictically certain. Other *ḥadīths* opposing interreligious military alliance might have circulated widely among the early Muslims, but been overlooked by later jurists who wrote on the topic. Or, certain Qur'ānic verses (such as 3:28, 3:118, or 5:51) might have been widely read as forbidding the recruitment of non-Muslims, but their significance for

the matter been ignored or rejected by later jurists.³² Or, versions of these three *ḥadīths* might have left Medina earlier than the extant *isnāds* reveal, and circulated widely, but memory of these early transmissions have been lost.³³ These and other such possibilities are remote. The permissive views on military alliance with non-Muslims held by such early figures as al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742), Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), al-Awzā'ī (d. 157/774), and al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) also suggest that there were no early, widely accepted Islamic reasons against such alliance.³⁴ As I suggest below, this diversity of opinion also highlights the possibility that the three *ḥadīths* entered circulation in the context of debates on the issue, and not prior to these debates.

32 There does exist a report that Q. 3:28 was revealed to the Prophet so that 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit (d. ca. 34/654 or 55) would not accept the aid of 500 Jewish fighters. It occurs with a unique *isnād*, and was not widely known among jurists. It was purportedly included in *tafsīr* material attributed to Ibn 'Abbās (d. 68/687 or 688) by al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāḥim (d. ca. 105/723), according to Juwaybara b. Sa'īd al-Azdī (d. ca. 145/762). Al-Ḍaḥḥāk is said to have heard Ibn 'Abbās' *tafsīr* material from the Kūfan Sa'īd b. Jubayr (d. 95/713–714) in Rayy, and Juwaybara, who was regarded as an extremely suspect transmitter, heard from al-Ḍaḥḥāk in Balkh. The observation that these are the same eastern environs in which the well armed squadron *ḥadīth* circulated proves significant; in fact, a version of the well armed squadron *ḥadīth* was also attributed via Juwaybara to al-Ḍaḥḥāk as final authority. Clearly the *ḥadīth* was borrowed without acknowledgment, and other *tafsīr* material extrapolated from it. It is textually linked to the version given by Ibn Abī Shayba. For this rare version, see al-Shaybānī, *Kitāb al-siyar li-l-Shaybānī*, ed. M. Khaddūrī (Beirut: al-Dār al-Muttaḥida li-l-Nashr, 1975), 99, no. 41; al-Samarqandī, *Tafsīr al-Samarqandī*, ed. 'A. Mu'awwaḍ et al. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1993), 1:314. For the 'Ubāda tradition, see Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken*, 234, and to his citations add al-Tha'labī, *al-Kashf wa-l-bayān*, ed. Abū Muḥammad b. 'Āshūr (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2002), 3:47. On al-Ḍaḥḥāk, see A. Paket-Chy and C. Gilliot, "Works on *ḥadīth* and its Codification, on Exegesis, and on Theology," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, ed. C.E. Bosworth and M.S. Asimov (Paris: UNESCO, 2000), 4:98, part. 2. For another isolated *ḥadīth* on this topic, somehow related to that concerning Khubayb, see Notes to Figure 2.3.

33 This possibility is raised, for instance, by the appearance of textually distinct versions, without *isnāds*, in other sources, notable the *Sharḥ Kitāb al-siyar* of al-Sarakhsī (attrib. to al-Shaybānī) and the *Kitāb al-maghāzī* of al-Wāqidī. These are readily explicable within the model of transmission here proposed; al-Wāqidī was Medinan, and al-Shaybānī knew only the *ḥadīth* about the well-armed squadron, which we know to have circulated in al-Shaybānī's native Kūfa (via Ya'lā b. 'Ubayd and, possibly, Sa'īd b. Yahyā, a Kufan who settled in Damascus) at an early enough date for him to have learned it thence. Al-Shaybānī also studied in Medina with Mālik, transmitting the *Muwatta'*, but evinces no knowledge of the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr. See Figures 2.1–2.3 and Notes thereto.

34 For these views, see Ibn Qudāma, *Mughnī*, 13:97 ff., and Ibn Ḥazm, *Muḥallā*, 7:334–335.

4 Toward Using the *ḥadīths* as Historical Sources

At present it is not possible to reach conclusions about the historical accuracy of the three *ḥadīths* that contain the dictum. Such conclusions will require study of all available evidence of the limits set by Muḥammad on inclusion in the polity he founded, and in its military activities in particular. Nevertheless, it will be expedient to prepare the way for such study by gesturing to a few features of the evidence that are relevant to the question of historical accuracy. Preliminary indications are that Fred Donner's vision of regular military cooperation among various monotheists in Islam's early decades does not face a serious challenge from this quarter. The evidence is addressed under two headings: *isnāds* and *matns*.

4.1 *Isnāds*

The usual source problem of early Islamic history applies fully to these *ḥadīths*. They are first found in works compiled nearly two centuries after the events they relate. Their *isnāds* remain – for us as for medieval Muslims – the chief means of evaluating their utility as historical sources for those events. While I have argued that careful examination of the *isnāds* leads to a much earlier dating for the *ḥadīths* than for the works in which they are contained – earlier, even, than a Schachtian or Juynbollian reader of the *isnāds* would conclude – it does not yield the conclusion that they represent accurate accounts of Muḥammad's life. In each of the three cases, in fact, the early portions of the *isnāds* contain points of uncertainty that call into question the continuity of their transmission from the time of Muḥammad. After converging on Medina, each *isnād* enters a phase of obscurity. These phases are briefly noted below for each *ḥadīth*.

The *isnād* attached to the *ḥadīth* about the squadron of Jews bears signs of having "grown" backwards. Specifically, the only two versions which do not claim to have been transmitted in Marw by al-Faḍl b. Mūsā name only one transmitter earlier than the common link, Muḥammad b. 'Amr, but all of the versions transmitted by al-Faḍl name two (see Figure 2.1 and Notes thereto). One of these two versions, that of Ibn Abī Shayba, names Sa'd b. al-Mundhir (d. ?) as the informant of Muḥammad b. 'Amr and the ultimate authority for the tradition (all the versions which pass via al-Faḍl also name Sa'd, but not as the ultimate authority). The other version, that of the compiler Hishām b. 'Ammār (d. 245/859), gives the name "al-Munkadir b. Ḥumayd al-Anṣārī," which is a corruption of the full name of the same Sa'd b. al-Mundhir. The important point is that Hishām b. 'Ammār's version contains only one name – surely that of Sa'd b. al-Mundhir – allegedly predating the common link. A traditional *ḥadīth*

critic would call both versions *munqaṭiʿ* or *mursal*, because they narrate events without claim of direct witness thereto. Critical re-reading can often discern in such versions, when they are early and have likewise underdeveloped *matns*, the backward growth of an *isnād*. The older name (a *kunya*, Abū Ḥumayd), found only in *isnāds* via al-Faḍl, happens to be the grandfather of the same Saʿd b. al-Mundhir; his personal name, according to some authorities, was also Saʿd b. al-Mundhir. The younger Saʿd b. al-Mundhir was an extremely obscure figure, who transmitted from only two people, one of whom was this grandfather, and to only two people, one of whom was Muḥammad b. ʿAmr. There are thus indications that a primitive version of the *ḥadīth* narrated by Muḥammad b. ʿAmr did not claim to go back to a contemporary of the events described, and that the appearance of such a claim was created later. At any rate, the transmission is too muddled for one to set great store by the early reaches of the *isnād* on its own merits. The Medinan Muḥammad b. ʿAmr (d. 144 or 145/761) is the earliest person who can be said with any confidence to have transmitted the *ḥadīth*.

One encounters similar patches of obscurity in the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr, beyond the curious fact that such a vividly instructive tale should have languished in occultation until the middle of the second Islamic century. This is apparently the only report of any kind that ʿAbd Allāh b. Niyār (d. ?) transmitted from the famous ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712),³⁵ giving it an anomalous appearance; it is not corroborated by any of the numerous other accounts that ʿUrwa related about Muḥammad's life, to transmitters with whom he had sustained interaction. ʿAbd Allāh b. Niyār is a hazy figure. His father's name frequently comes through as Dīnār, and the famously reliable Kūfan transmitter Wakīʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ is supposed³⁶ to have split him in two, giving the *isnāds* of this report (as preserved in such works as the *Sunans* of Ibn Māja and al-Dārimī and the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba) without Mālik's alleged informant, al-Fuḍayl b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh, in the form Mālik – ʿAbd Allāh b. Yazīd – Ibn Niyār (Ibn Māja, Ibn Abī Shayba, and Ibn Ḥanbal *apud* al-Khallāl) or Mālik – ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnār (al-Dārimī). This would not be so problematic – even Wakīʿ can be forgiven the occasional mistake – but for the fact that Wakīʿ also knew only a version of the report limited to the naked dictum. Once again, the concurrence of a truncated *matn* with a muddled *isnād* makes it look as though a primitive early version of the report underwent later improvement. Mālik's alleged informant, al-Fuḍayl b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh, is another extremely obscure transmitter whom Mālik virtually “monopolized,” and who allegedly transmitted from only one person other

35 Görke and Schoeler, *Ältesten Berichte*, 101, 252, 254.

36 In the opinion of, among many others, al-Dāraquṭnī (see Notes to Figure 2.2).

than the hazy 'Abd Allāh b. Niyār. Mālik is supposed to have transmitted from both Medinan transmitters who narrated the other two *ḥadīth* containing the dictum, which, if one regards his alleged informant al-Fuḍayl as a spurious link in the *isnād*, could explain how he really heard it. He might of course really have learned it from al-Fuḍayl (or from an unknown transmitter), whose version might or might not have been informed by the others then circulating in Medina.

The *ḥadīth* about the rejection of Khubayb also appears to have passed through a long tunnel of obscurity in Medina, in this case a tri-generational family *isnād* – before breaking into public view in late second/eighth-century Wāsiṭ. Only a single, minor Wāsiṭī appears to have heard it in Medina, but upon its arrival in Wāsiṭ it attracted considerable interest. In this case we have no evidence of layers of development in the *isnād*, but neither does that *isnād* encourage one to endorse it as a guarantor of the account's accuracy.

It is true that the authenticity of many early reports about Muḥammad's life is subject to similar vague concerns. Some comparable reports, however, can be shown with varying degrees of certainty to have been in circulation within a few decades of Muḥammad's death, and even to contain factual elements.³⁷ These three *ḥadīth* do not belong to this group. The problematic aspects of their *isnāds* should make historians attentive to indications that they were shaped by forces other than memory of the events they describe. Specifically, taken along with the evidence of their contents, the *isnāds* suggest that these *ḥadīth* bear the marks of second/eighth-century juristic controversies. Although I will not study these controversies exhaustively in this paper, a base for such study is laid in the Conclusion.

4.2 *Matns*

The aspect of the three *ḥadīths'* contents most relevant to the question of authenticity is, in fact, external: the fact that there exist multiple *ḥadīth* that convey precisely the opposite normative message. The term "precisely" is used advisedly. Muḥammad may have been inconsistent in his policies, but it is striking that he should have both allied and refused to ally with precisely the

37 See Motzki's guardedly optimistic conclusions in "The Murder of Ibn Abi l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some *Maghāzī* Reports," in *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*, ed. H. Motzki (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 170–239. In a careful recent study of reports attributed to 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Görke and Schoeler conclude that these "reflect the general outline of the events correctly"; it is noteworthy that they are cool toward the *ḥadīth* allegedly from 'Urwa with which we are dealing here (pp. 101, 252, 254, 284, 294 [whence the quotation]).

same Jewish tribe. Yet this is what he did, if we believe a *ḥadīth* cited by al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/687 or 88). Other reports, found in the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq and often associated with Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri, also claim that Muḥammad allied with Jews, without giving particulars. They are also concerned with the share of the spoils to be given to *mushrikūn* who fight alongside the Muslims, taking it for granted that they may do so.³⁸ It is beyond the scope of this essay to subject these reports to the critical scrutiny they deserve. Thus I refrain from drawing conclusions about whether this contradiction arises from inconsistencies in Muḥammad's policies, or castoff armaments forged for early juristic debates. Preliminary study suggests the latter. The trajectory of thought among Muslim jurists generally was increasingly to oppose the employment of non-Muslims in political and military roles. As time went on, transmitters would thus have been increasingly likely to have circulated *ḥadīths* that opposed such employment than ones that supported it. Moreover, it is *prima facie* more plausible that the nascent Islamic state was pragmatically willing to accept military aid from non-Muslims, and that later jurists voiced opposition to the practice from a position of strength, than that Muḥammad took a little-remembered, principled stand on the matter from a position of Muslim weakness only for later scholars to compose *ḥadīths* that cast him in a more inclusive role.

The contradiction between these two sets of *ḥadīths* was perceived by jurists. For those opposed to accepting military aid from infidels, one strategy was to discredit the *ḥadīth* that claimed that Muḥammad allied with Jews and *mushrikūn* (in the latter case, the *mushrik* is usually Ṣafwān b. Umayya, who fought for the Muslim cause at the Battle of Ḥunayn). Ibn al-Mundhir al-Naysābūrī,³⁹ for instance, ruled that infidel assistance was unlawful because of the *ḥadīth* about the well-armed squadron and the *mushrik* of Badr, declaring that al-Shāfiʿī's account of the Banū Qaynuqāʿ could not serve as proof because its source was not firmly known.⁴⁰ Al-Ḥāzimī (d. 584/1188) cited the oppos-

38 ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf fī l-ḥadīth*, ed. Ḥ. al-Aʿzamī (Beirut: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī, 1970–), 5:188–189, no. 9328–9330; Friedmann, *Tolerance*, 37, no. 130; Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken*, 251f. Cf. Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām, *Kitāb al-amwāl*, ed. M. ʿUmāra (Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 1989), 294, no. 120; and especially the wealth of reports in Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fī l-aḥādīth wa-l-āthār*, ed. K.Y. al-Ḥūt (Beirut: Dār al-Tāj, 1989), 6:487f.

39 On Ibn al-Mundhir see Scott Lucas, “Abu Bakr Ibn al-Mundhir, Amputation, and the Art of Ijtihād,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 39, no. 3 (2007): 352–354.

40 Ibn al-Mundhir, *al-Awsaṭ*, 11:77. He had plainly read only the first of al-Shāfiʿī's two discussions of the issue; in the second an *isnād* is given, obviating Ibn al-Mundhir's charge that “perhaps he took this from the *maghāzī* reports.” Al-Shāfiʿī quotes several authorities

ing view, found in al-Shāfiʿi's *Kitāb al-Umm*, that the principle established by the *ḥadīth* about the *mushrik* of Badr was abrogated by that in which Muḥammad received support from Ṣafwān b. Umayya.⁴¹ The Imāmī al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1375) made Muḥammad's stance conform to two later conditions for accepting non-Muslim aid, explaining what Muḥammad really meant by the dictum: "By this he meant [that infidel aid was to be refused] in the absence of one of the two conditions." These conditions are 1. that the Muslims have need of assistance, and 2. that the non-Muslims be trustworthy. Al-Ḥillī cites the *ḥadīths* about the *mushrik* of Badr and the rejection of Khubayb, explaining away the contradiction in several ways. They assume the lack of need for assistance, or lack of trustworthiness in the infidels in question, or Muḥammad's prophetic knowledge that if he pronounced the dictum the *mushrik* would convert, or that both *ḥadīth* were abrogated by Muḥammad's later alliance with the Banū Qaynuqāʿ.

Al-Ṭaḥāwī, in a subtle treatment of the problem that cites all three *ḥadīths*, distinguished between "seeking assistance" (*istiʿāna bi-*) and "fighting with." Muḥammad would naturally not seek the assistance of a *mushrik*, but had no objection to one "fighting with" him. What then, he asks rhetorically, of the *ḥadīth* (not discussed above) in which Muḥammad begs Jews of the Banū al-Naḍir for military aid on the eve of Uḥud? Al-Ṭaḥāwī answers that Jews are not *mushrikūn*. In fact, vis-à-vis *mushrikūn*, Muslims and Jews are, as *ahl al-kitāb*, "a single hand," and there is no bar to fighting alongside them. Why then Muḥammad's rejection of the well armed squadron? This, al-Ṭaḥāwī tells us, is because by allying with Ibn Ubayy the B. Qaynuqāʿ had forfeited their Jewishness and become *de facto* *mushrikūn*.

There are difficulties with this creative explanation. First, Ibn Ubayy was not himself a *mushrik*, but a *munāfiq* at worst, and at Uḥud his most violent disagreements with Muḥammad still lay ahead of him. Did a group of Jews become *mushrikūn* by allying with a man who was not himself a *mushrik*? Second, the text cannot bear this interpretation, for even if we disregard the two versions that do not mention Ibn Ubayy, we must still make sense of Muḥammad's question: "Have they converted?"⁴² In al-Ṭaḥāwī's scenario, converted

to the effect that the Prophet's alliance with non-Muslims was universally acknowledged, and that the debate revolved around the share of the spoils due to them.

41 al-Ḥāzimi, *Kitāb al-iʿtibār* (Hyderabad: Maṭbaʿat Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʾārif al-ʿUthmāniya, 1940), 218f.

42 Al-Ṭaḥāwī's is the only version in which the Prophet commands the Jews to convert. In all others he *asks* whether they have already converted. The *question* implies that alliance with Ibn Ubayy is compatible with eligibility (of Muslims) to fight for the Prophet. Al-

allies of Ibn Ubayy, who in concluding such an alliance must have broken faith with Muḥammad as much as if they had remained Jews, could fight as Muslims, but his unconverted Jewish allies, as *mushrikūn*, could not (unless perhaps they fought “with” the Muslims without seeking Muḥammad’s explicit consent?). As casuistry, al-Ṭahāwī’s solution is a triumph, but as historical explanation it falls short. Most jurists took the text at face value: Jews are *mushrikūn*, and their military assistance must be rejected.

There is a final difficulty with the *ḥadīth* about the well-armed squadron: some sources report that the Banū Qaynuqā’ were expelled from Medina before Uḥud.⁴³ What were they doing there on the day of the battle? A learned article by Abū l-Walīd Khālīd b. Fathī b. Khālīd al-Aghā al-Ghazzī al-Anṣārī (b. 1386/1966 or 1967) undertakes to resolve this chronological problem.⁴⁴ Al-Ghazzī himself takes the view that the *isnād* is weak, but since several esteemed early compilers saw fit to cite the *ḥadīth* he attempts to date the expulsion of Banū Qaynuqā’ to after Uḥud. His strategy is to impugn the reliability of people who wrote *maghāzī*, while leveraging canonical *ḥadīths* that allude to a Banū Qaynuqā’ presence in Medina after their supposed expulsion. He might have adopted a more straightforward explanation, had he not erred in stating that the version given by Ibn Abī Shayba does not mention Uḥud, but does mention Banū Qaynuqā’. In fact, the reverse is true. This means that this version corresponds perfectly in this respect with that of Hishām b. ‘Ammār, which like it bypasses the transmitter by which all other versions travel (al-Faḍl b. Mūsā). Both versions, as we have seen, also have defective *isnāds*. The problematic presence of six hundred well-armed Banū Qaynuqā’ in the countryside around Medina months after the tribe’s expulsion, if one believes al-Wāqidi’s account, is thus readily explained as al-Faḍl’s initiative to renovate the *matn* as he had done the *isnād*.

Ṭahāwī would of course want to avoid this implication. He holds that allying with Ibn Ubayy has made *mushrikūn* of Jews; would it be without relevant effect on Muslims? The command, by contrast, implies that the squadron must take a decisive step to associate with the Prophet, and to dissociate from Ibn Ubayy. This squares with al-Ṭahāwī’s argument; he may have altered the text to achieve this effect.

43 J.M.B. Jones, “The Chronology of the ‘Maghāzī’: A Textual Survey,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19, no. 2 (1957): 247; on the expulsion see Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken*, 230–255, who sees *sīra* accounts of the episode as having been constructed from exegetical material or patterned on similar accounts. The dating (and even occurrence) of this particular expulsion is by no means certain, but this *ḥadīth* should not serve as a fixed point by which to establish it (cf. Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken*, 251 f.).

44 Entitled *al-Qilāda al-ḥasnā’ fī al-kalām ‘alā ḥadīth al-katība al-khashnā’*, this article is available at https://archive.org/details/alqilada_alhasna.

Future historical study of these three *ḥadīths* will take account of the parallels to be found in the *Maghāzī* of the Medinan al-Wāqidī, and in the work of his scribe, Ibn Sa'd (see Notes to Figures 2.1 and 2.3). Al-Wāqidī knew of both the rejection of Khubayb, which he gives in a form vastly more detailed than any version of the *ḥadīth*, and that of the well-armed squadron, which is somewhat truncated and uses markedly different language. It is not currently possible to determine whether these accounts represent independent parallels or creative appropriations of these *ḥadīths*.

5 Conclusion

It may eventually be possible to learn more about the circumstances under which the dictum and the narratives in which it is embedded were formulated. Even in the early Islamic heartland of Medina, it is not difficult to identify potential reasons to condemn the recruitment of non-Muslim fighters: the Christian Taghlibites in the army of Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya who marched under the banner of St. Sergius, for instance, or the two hundred Christians of Ayla who were employed by Mu'āwiya to keep order in Medina.⁴⁵ Or, the catalyst might have been not an event but an objectionable doctrine, such as the one implied in the *ḥadīth* that Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri narrated in Medina, describing Muḥammad's military cooperation with Jews. On this model, the Medinan origin of these three *ḥadīths* might be explained by reference to the fact that al-Zuhri, arguably the Marwānids' most important learned apologist, happened to be Medinan. These are hypotheses to be tested in future studies, not the conclusions of this one.

Instead, the following arguments have been made in this essay: all versions of the three *ḥadīths* that embed variations on the dictum "I will not accept aid from a *mushrik*" in a distinctive narrative sequence arose from a proto-version that circulated in Medina no later than the first half of the second/eighth century. The principle that the dictum expresses influenced conceptions of the religious modalities of legitimate state control in early Islam. There is a variety of reasons, most notably obscurities in putative paths of transmission and striking contradictions with parallel accounts, to be wary of assigning these *ḥadīths* an earlier date. The common geographical origin indicated by the *isnāds*, which can be shown to convey accurate data about paths of transmission, offers the most plausible explanation for their shared content. I have also suggested that

45 Fattal, *Le statut*, 234.

before the 'Abbāsid period, during the period of their most dramatic military gains, the Arabian conquerors are unlikely to have shared any principled reasons not to recruit non-Muslims, as such.

In addition, the rural setting of the events narrated in these three *ḥadīth* provided rhetorical advantages to their transmitters. It reinforced the proprietary nature of their knowledge of Muḥammad's normative dictum, raising the authority value of the reports by implicitly limiting their potential circulation. It leveraged the real implications of rural settings for pre-modern fighting forces, implying that if Muḥammad did not accept non-Muslim aid in the transitional, invisible desert, where the boundaries of fighting forces were porous, then such aid was *a fortiori* illicit in cities, or on the rural battlefield. Finally, movement among the arid spaces of the Ḥijāzī hinterland created rhetorical space for the repetition and consequent reinforcement of the dictum, and thus of the normative principle it encapsulates. In both this narratological analysis and in adapting the TT Test formulated by Behnam Sadeghi, I have suggested that imagined rural spaces played significant roles in the spatial extension of normative authority in the early Islamic period, and that Islamicists should appreciate the multiple roles played by extra- and inter-urban physical space in their study of the *ḥadīth* and *akhbār*, our most important sources for the history of early Islam.

Appendix

Notes to Figure 2.1

Transmitters (dates approximate)

Abū Mu'āwiya 'Abbād b. 'Abbād b. Ḥabīb al-Muhallabī al-Baṣrī, d. 181/797, mixed evaluations of reliability, significant transmitter, al-Ṭabarānī gives no *isnād* between 'Abbād and himself (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl*, edited by B. A. Ma'rūf, 35 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1992), 14:128ff., no. 3083); Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā'idī al-Anṣārī al-Madanī, d. 60/680, grandfather of Sa'd, transmits also to 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, said (perhaps due to this report) to have witnessed Uḥud (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 2004), 7:350, no. 9602); Abū Muslim Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Junayd (I am unable to identify this informant of al-Ḥāzimī); Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abdūs al-'Anazī al-Ṭarā'ifī al-Naysābūrī, d. 346/957, described as the *musnad* of Naysābūr (Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1969), 3:863); Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Faḍl b. Mūsā al-Sīnānī al-Marwazī, b. 115/733, d. 192/807, generally quite reliable, but narrated *manākīr* (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 5:265 f., no. 6392); Abū

Ṣāliḥ Hudīya b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Marwazī, d. 241/855, little known, mixed reviews, explicitly linked to both al-Faḍl and Ibn Abī ‘Āsim (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 6:627, no. 8538); Abu l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, **Ibn Fād-hishāh** al-Iṣbahānī, d. 433/1041, good marks, bad theology, major transmitter from al-Ṭabarānī (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar a’lām al-nubalā’*, edited by Sh. al-Arna’ūṭ et al., 25 vols. (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1981–), 17:515f., no. 339); **Khālid b. Khidāsh** b. ‘Ajlān al-Azdī al-Baṣrī, d. 223/838, *mawlā*, both strong and weak marks (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 2:264f., no. 1921); Abū Manṣūr **Maḥmūd b. Ismā’il** b. Muḥammad al-Ashqar al-Iṣbahānī, d. 514/1121, transmitter of al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Mu’jam al-kabīr* (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 19:428f., no. 250); Abū Bakr **Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Shu’ayb** b. ‘Adī al-Simsār, d. 290/903, minor transmitter, moved in Baghdād Ḥanbalī circles (Nāyif b. Ṣalāḥ al-Manṣūrī, *Irshād al-qaṣī wal-dānī ilā tarājim shuyūkh al-Ṭabarānī* (Riyadh: Dār al-Kayān, 2006), 594, no. 966); **Muḥammad b. ‘Amr** b. ‘Alqama al-Laythī al-Madanī, d. 144 or 5/761, mediocre transmitter, Mālik allegedly did not think highly of him, but narrated from him in the *Muwatta’a* (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 5:772f., no. 7322); **al-Munkadir b. Ḥumayd** al-Anṣārī [sic], a corruption of names belonging to earlier transmitters (Mundhir, [Ibn] Abī Ḥumayd, al-Anṣārī); Abū ‘Imrān **Mūsā b. Hārūn** b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bazzāz, d. 294/907, high marks, alternated years in Baghdad and Mecca before old age (al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rikh madīnat al-salām* [TMS], edited by B.‘A. Ma’rūf, 17 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Ma’rifa, 2001), 15:48ff., no. 6971); **Sa’d b. al-Mundhir** b. Abī Ḥumayd al-Sā’idī al-Anṣārī al-Madanī, d.?, narrates from his grandfather and one other person, and to Muḥammad and one other person – altogether minor and obscure (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 2:611f., no. 2658); **Sa’id b. Yahyā** b. Ṣāliḥ al-Lakhmī al-Kūfī, d.?, mixed marks tending to positive, settled in Damascus (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 2:701f., no. 2837); **‘Ubayd b. Rijāl** = Abu l-Qāsim ‘Ubayd b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Bazzāz al-Miṣrī, d. 284/897, a major informant of al-Taḥāwī (Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī, *Maghānī al-akhyār fī sharḥ asāmī rijāl ma’ānī al-āthār*, edited by A.M. al-Ṭayyib, 3 vols. (Mecca: Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā, 1997), 2:685); **‘Uthmān b. Sa’id** b. Khālid al-Sijistānī al-Dārimī, d. 280/894, a pro-traditionist Ḥanafī, travelled extensively as a cloth merchant, died in Herāt (Josef van Ess, “Dāremī, Abū Sa’id ‘Othmān,” in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, edited by E. Yarshater (London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982–), 7:31f.); **Yā’lā b. ‘Ubayd** b. Umayya al-Iyādī al-Kūfī, b. 117/735, d. 209/825, *mawlā*, very high marks (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 7:226f., no. 9170); Abū Ya’qūb **Yūsuf b. ‘Īsā** b. Dīnār al-Zuhri al-Marwazī, d. 249/863, well respected (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 7:244f., no. 9209).

Sources

Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, edited by M. ‘Aṭā, 11 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiya, 1994), 9:64, no. 17878; Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ‘ala l-ṣaḥīḥayn*, 5 vols. (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1997), 2:147, no. 2620; al-Ḥāzimī, *Kitāb al-i’tibār*, 218f. The *isnād* given for this *ḥadīth* is corrupt: for Maḥmūd b. Ismā‘īl – Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, read Maḥmūd b. Ismā‘īl b. Muḥammad – Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn; Abu l-Walīd Hishām b. ‘Ammār al-Dimashqī, *Ḥadīth Hishām b. ‘Ammār*, edited by M. Āl Ḥumayd (Riyadh: Dār Ishbīliya, 1999), 391, no. 138; Aḥmad b. ‘Amr al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Abī ‘Āsim, *al-Āḥād wa-l-mathānī*, edited by B.F. al-Jawābira, 6 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, 1991), 4:97, no. 2068; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, 6:488, no. 33160, 7:369, no. 36767 (this version contains the variant *lā nasta‘nu bi-l-kuffār*); Ibn al-Mundhir, *al-Awsaṭ*, 11:176, no. 6564; Ibn Sa‘d, Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, edited by ‘A.M. ‘Umar, 11 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 2001), 2:45; Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu‘jam al-awsaṭ*, 10 vols. (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1995), 5:221, no. 5142; al-Taḥāwī, *Sharḥ*, 6:316f., no. 2580.

Cf.

- a version close to that of Ibn Abī Shayba but attributed to an eighth-century *mufasssīr* (see n. 32 above);
- a version, without *isnād*, considerably interpreted, in Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Sarakhsī, *Sharḥ kitāb al-sīyar al-kabīr*, edited by Š. al-Munajjid, 5 vols. (Cairo: Ma‘had al-Makḥṭūṭāt bi-Jāmi‘at al-Duwal al-‘Arabīya, 1971–1972), 4:1423, no. 2753 – in text ascribed to al-Shaybānī (d. 189/805);
- a version without *isnād*, embedded in the account of Uḥud and stripped of much detail, in al-Wāqidī, *The Kitāb al-Maghāzī of al-Wāqidī*, edited by M. Jones, 3 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 1:215f.;
- a related account, with partial *isnād* (Ibn Wahb [Egypt] – Jarīr b. Ḥāzim al-Baṣrī – al-Zuhrī [Medina/Syria]), in which the Anṣār ask why they do not seek the aid at Uḥud of their Jewish confederates (*allā nasta‘na bi-ḥulafā’inā mina l-yahūd*) – the Prophet responds *lā ḥājata lanā fihim* (Saḥnūn b. Sa‘īd al-Tanūkhī, *al-Mudawwana al-kubrā*, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiya, 1994), 1:525). This response reflects pragmatic more than principled opposition to seeking military aid from Jews.

Notes to Figure 2.2

Transmitters

‘Abd Allāh b. Niyār b. Makram al-Madanī al-Aslamī, d. ?, an obscure early figure from whom Mālik allegedly claimed to narrate, but who was also conflated with a certain Companion, *nasab* in these *isnāds* often comes through as Dīnār, this is the sole *ḥadīth* he is known to narrate from ‘Urwa (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 3:688 f., no. 4263); **Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Yūsuf al-Kalā’ī al-Miṣrī al-Tinnīsī**, d. 218/833, originally Damascene, major transmitter from Mālik, good marks, settled in Egypt (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 3:714 f., no. 4324); **Abu l-‘Abbās ‘Abd al-Malik b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zayyāt**, d. 330/942, minor figure, good marks, moved in Baghdādī circles (al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *TMS*, 7:184, no. 5541); **Abu l-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb b. Yūsuf al-Sinānī al-Aṣamm al-Naysābūrī**, d. 346/957, major figure, high marks (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 15:452 f., no. 258); **Abu l-Mundhir Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar al-Wāsiṭī**, d. after 200/816, a trader, settled in Baghdād, good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 3:154 ff., no. 468); **Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qurashī al-Umawī al-Miṣrī**, d. 250/864, major transmitter, good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 1:415 ff., no. 86); **Abū Umayya Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Muslim al-Khuzā‘ī al-Thaghri al-Ṭarasūsī**, d. 273/886, originally Baghdādī or Sijistānī, good marks, settled in Tarsus, travelled to Egypt to transmit without his book, causing mistakes (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 24:327 ff., no. 5032); **Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Ṣūfī al-Kabīr al-Baghdādī**, d. 306/918, good marks, minor figure (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 14:152 f., no. 88); **‘Āisha bt. Abī Bakr**, d. 58/678, wife of and major transmitter from the Prophet, and to ‘Urwa, was ca. 10 years old at the time of the expedition she describes (W. Montgomery Watt, *s.n.*, in *ET*²); **Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mubashshir al-Wāsiṭī**, d. 324/936 (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 15:25, no. 13); **Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Qurashī al-Makhzūmī al-Kūfī→al-Miṣrī (‘Allān)**, d. 272/886, active, few but good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 21:51 ff., no. 4101); **‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Khaṣīb al-Hāshimī al-Washshā’ al-Kūfī**, d. 258/872, minor figure, mixed marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 21:123 f., no. 4129); **Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Amr b. ‘Alī b. Baḥr al-Bāhilī al-Fallās al-Baṣrī**, d. 249/864, significant transmitter, high marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 22:162 ff., no. 4416); **Abū Mūsā Ishāq b. Mūsā b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī al-Khaṭmī al-Madanī→al-Kūfī**, d. 244/858, good marks, transmitted also in Baghdād and Sāmarrā’, served as *qāḍī* in Naysābūr, went to Syria with al-Mutawakkil, where he died (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 2:480 ff., no. 385); **Abū Muḥammad Bishr b. ‘Umar b. al-Ḥakam al-Zahrānī al-Azdī al-Baṣrī**, d. 207/822, high marks, noteworthy transmitter of Mālik’s works (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 4:138 ff., no. 701); **al-Fuḍayl b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Madanī**, d. ?, *mawlā*, narrates from Ibn Niyār and one other person, to Mālik and one other person, very obscure (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 5:270 f., no. 6402); **Abu ‘Amr Ḥafṣ**

b. ‘Amr b. Rabāl al-Raqāshī al-Baṣrī, d. 258/872, good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 7:52 ff., no. 1413); **Ibn Abī Uways** = Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Madanī, d. 226/841, nephew of Mālik, well known but very weak (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 3:124 ff., no. 459); **Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Mahdī** b. Ḥassān al-‘Anbarī al-Baṣrī, d. 198/814, pivotal transmitter, sterling marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 17:430 ff., no. 3969); **Ibn al-Mubārak** = ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanzalī, d. 181/797, major transmitter, good marks, travelled widely (James Robson, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Qāsim** b. Khālīd al-‘Utaqī, d. 191/806, the most important disciple of Mālik, key transmitter of his corpus, less so of *ḥadīth*, died in Egypt (Joseph Schacht, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **Abū ‘Uthmān Sa‘īd b. Kathīr Ibn ‘Ufayr al-Miṣrī**, d. 226/841, learned, strongly mixed marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 11:36 ff., no. 2344); **‘Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb** b. Muslim al-Fihri al-Qurashī, d. 197/813, famous Egyptian pupil of Mālik (Jean David-Weill, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **‘Imrān b. Mūsā al-Dajjājī** (I am unable to identify this transmitter); **Abū Yaḥyā ‘Īsā b. Aḥmad** b. ‘Īsā al-Baghdādī/al-Balkhī, d. 268/882, very active, little discussed, few but positive marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 22:584 ff., no. 4617); **Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Makhlad al-Marwazī, Ibn Rāhawayh**, d. 238/853, *nazīl Naysābūr*, famous, highly esteemed and well travelled transmitter, frequently narrated reports discouraging interreligious fraternization (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 2:261 ff., no. 332); **Abū ‘Abd Allāh Mālik b. Anas** b. Mālik al-Aṣbaḥī al-Madanī, d. 179/796, eponym of the Mālikī school of law, giant of early Islamic legal thought (Joseph Schacht, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **Abū Yaḥyā Ma‘n b. ‘Īsā** b. Yaḥyā al-Ashja‘ī al-Qazzāz al-Madanī, d. 198/814, *mawlā*, major student of Mālik, mixed reviews tending to positive (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 22:336 ff., no. 6115); **Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh** b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam al-Miṣrī, d. 268/882, scion of a famous scholarly family, well regarded as transmitter (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 25:497 ff., no. 5354); **Muḥammad b. Ḥayyawayh** = M. b. Yaḥyā b. Mūsā al-Isfarāyīnī, d. 259/873, good marks, a local favorite in Isfarāyīn (Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*, edited by ‘A. Shīrī, 80 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995–1998), 56:232 ff., no. 7102; al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 12:360 f., no. 153); **Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ziyād b. Ma‘rūf al-‘Ijlī al-Rāzī**, d. 257/871, good marks, settled in the town of Jurjān (al-Sahmī, *Ta’rīkh Jurjān* (Hyderabad: Maṭba‘at Majlis Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-‘Uthmāniya, 1950), 340, no. 639); **Abū l-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Salama** b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Murādī al-Jamālī al-Miṣrī, d. 248/862, *mawlā*, student of Ibn al-Qāsim, good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 25:287 ff., no. 5254); **Abū l-Ḥasan Musaddad** b. Musarhad b. Musarbal al-Asadī al-Baṣrī, d. 228/843, well-known, high marks, odd name acknowledged (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 27:443 ff., no. 5899); **Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād al-Khuzā‘ī al-Marwazī**, d. 228/843, lived in Egypt and Baghdād, suspected of fabricating *ḥadīth* (Charles Pellat, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **Nu‘mān b. Shibl al-Bāhilī al-Baṣrī**, d. ?, very weak, suspect transmit-

ter, known to narrate from Mālik, who with al-Fuḍayl is skipped in this *isnād* (Ibn 'Adī al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍu'afā' al-rijāl*, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984), 7:2480); Abū Muḥammad **Rawḥ** b. 'Ubāda b. al-'Alā' al-Baṣrī, d. 205/820, significant figure, mixed reviews (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 9:238, no. 1930); Abū l-Ḥusayn **Ṣāliḥ b. Aḥmad** b. Yūnus b. Abī Muqātil al-Qirāṭī al-Harawī, d. 316/928, moved to Baghdād, notorious liar (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 10:447 f., no. 4818); Abū 'Abd Allāh **'Urwa b. al-Zubayr** b. al-'Awwām al-Qurashī al-Asadī al-Madanī, d. 93/712, massively important early historian and transmitter (Görke/Schoeler, *'Urwa, passim*; Gregor Schoeler, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); Abū Sufyān **Wakī'** b. al-Jarrāḥ b. Malīḥ al-Kūfī, d. 197/812, a giant of *ḥadīth* transmission in his day (Raif Georges Khoury, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); **Yahyā b. Ma'īn** b. 'Awn al-Murrī al-Ghaṭafānī al-Baghdādī, d. 233/847, major transmitter and *ḥadīth* critic (Fred Leemhuis, *s.n.*, in *EI*²); Abū Sa'īd **Yahyā b. Sa'īd** b. Farrūkh al-Qaṭṭān al-Tamīmī al-Baṣrī, d. 198/813, extremely important transmitter and critic (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 31:329 ff., no. 6834); Abū Zakariyā **Yahyā b. 'Uthmān** b. Ṣāliḥ al-Qurashī al-Sahmī al-Miṣrī, d. 282/896, mediocre marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 31:462 ff., no. 6883); Abū Mūsā **Yūnus b. 'Abd al-'Alā** b. Maysara al-Ṣadafī al-Miṣrī (d. 264/877), major figure, high marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 32:513 ff., no. 7178); Abū Khaythama **Zuhayr b. Ḥarb** b. Shaddād al-Nasā'ī, d. 234/849, settled in Baghdād, good marks (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 9:402 ff., no. 2010).

Sources

Abū 'Awāna Ya'qūb b. Ishāq al-Isfarāyīnī, *Musnad Abī 'Awāna*, edited by A. 'Ā. al-Dimashqī, 5 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa, 1998), 4:339, no. 6900 f.; **Abū Dā'ūd** Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī, *Sunan Abī Dā'ūd*, edited by M. al-Khālīdī, 3 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1996), 2:280, no. 2732; al-**Bayhaqī**, *Sunan*, 9:63, no. 17877; 'Alī b. 'Umar al-**Dāraquṭnī**, *al-'Ilal*, edited by M. al-Dabbāsī, 16 vols. (al-Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2006), 14:211, no. 3565; 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-**Dārimī**, *Sunan al-Dārimī*, edited by F. Zamarlī and Kh. al-'Alamī, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1987), 2:305, no. 2496 f.; **Ibn 'Adī**, *Kāmil*, 7:2480, corroborated by an entry in Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī, *Dhakhīrat al-ḥuffāz*, edited by 'A. al-Faryawā'ī, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Dar al-Salaf, 1996), 5:2618, no. 6098 (with the apparently erroneous remark that only al-Nu'mān narrated this report from Mālik); **Ibn Abī Shayba**, *al-Muṣannaf*, 6:488, no. 33162; Aḥmad **Ibn Ḥanbal**, *Musnad al-imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal*, edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt and N. al-'Irsūsī, 52 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1993–2008), 40:450, no. 24386, 42:80 f., no. 25158, whence 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Taḥqīq fī aḥādīth al-khilāf*, edited by M. al-Sa'dānī, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1994–), 2:242, no. 1872, cf. the version traced to Ibn Ḥanbal in Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Khallāl, *Ahl al-milal*

wal-ridda ... min Kitāb al-jāmi', edited by I. b. Ḥ. b. Sulṭān (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 1996), 1:195 f., no. 332; **Ibn Ḥibbān** (d. 354/965) = Ibn Balabān = 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī b. al-Fārisī, *al-Iḥsān fī taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt, 18 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1991), 11: 28, no. 4726 (for other versions by *isnāds* via Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, see al-Mizzī, *al-Tahdhīb*, 16:232 f., and Abū Bakr b. al-Muqri' al-Iṣbahānī, *al-Muntakhab min gharā'ib aḥādīth Mālik b. Anas*, edited by R. Būshāma (Riyadh: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1999), 48 f., no. 11; as expected these versions agree in wording with that of Ibn Ḥibbān); **Ibn Jārūd** = 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī al-Naysābūrī, *Kitāb al-muntaqā* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1996), 398 f., no. 1048; **Ibn Māja** = Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Qazwīnī, *al-Sunan*, edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt, 5 vols. (Damascus: Dār al-Risāla al-'Ālamīya, 2009), 4:1010, no. 2832; **Ibn al-Mundhir**, *al-Awsaṭ*, 9:175, no. 6563 (for another version via a long *isnād* from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Ḥakam, see al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm al-Jawraqānī, *al-Abāṭil wa-l-manākīr wa-l-ṣiḥāḥ wa-l-mashāhīr*, edited by 'A. al-Faryawā'ī, 2 vols. (Benares: Idārat al-Buḥūth al-Islāmīya, 1983), 2:201 f.); **Ibn Sa'd**, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt*, 3:496; **Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh**, *Musnad*, edited by 'A. al-Balūshī, 5 vols. (Medina: Maktabat al-Īmān, 1990–1995), 2:256, no. 759_216; Ismā'īl b. Iṣḥāq al-Jahḍamī al-Azdī al-Qaḍī, *al-Juz' al-khāmis min musnad Mālik b. Anas*, edited by M. Muranyi (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2002), 70 f., no. 116; **Muslim** b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, edited by M.F. 'Abd al-Bāqī, 5 vols. (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabīya, 1955–1956), 3:1449, no. 1817, whence by an *isnād* to al-Ḥāzimī, *Kitāb al-i'tibār*, 217 f.; al-Nasā'ī, Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb, *Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā*, edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt, 12 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 2001), 8:85, no. 8707 f., 147, no. 8835, 10:304, no. 11536 whence by an *isnād* to Khalaf b. 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb ghawāmiḍ al-asmā' al-mubhama*, edited by 'I. al-Sayyid, M. 'Izz al-Dīn, 2 vols. (Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1987), 1:209 (for another version by an *isnād* via Muḥammad b. Salama, see 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd Allāh al-Jawharī, *Musnad al-Muwatta'*, edited by L. al-Ṣaghīr and Ṭ. Būsariḥ (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1997), 494 f., no. 628, according to which the tradition was found in three recensions of the *Muwatta'*, a point confirmed by Aḥmad b. Ṭāhir al-Dānī, *Kitāb al-īmā' ilā aṭrāf aḥādīth Kitāb al-muwatta'*, edited by 'A. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 2003), 4:469 f., no. 53); **Ṣaḥnūn**, *Mudawwana*, 1:525 f.; al-Ṭaḥāwī, 6:407 ff., no. 2572–2576; Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, 10 vols. (Ḥimṣ: Maṭābi' al-Fajr al-Ḥadītha, 1965–1968), 5:280, no. 1858.

Notes to Figure 2.3

Transmitters

'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, d. 290/903, son of and principal transmitter from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, active in Baghdād; Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh

b. Muḥammad b. al-ʿAbbās b. Khālīd al-Sulamī **al-Iṣbahānī**, d. 296/909, minor figure, described as *ṣāhib uṣūl* (al-Manṣūrī, *Irshād*, 389, no. 602); **ʿAbd Allāh** b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh **al-Juʿfī** al-Bukhārī al-Musnadī, d. 229/844, high marks, said to have brought *ḥadīth* from Wāsiṭ to Bukhārā, transmitted 44 *ḥadīth* to the famous al-Bukhārī (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 3:642 f., no. 4162); Abū Muḥammad **ʿAbd Allāh b. Rawḥ** al-Madāʾinī, d. 277/890, indifferent marks, minor figure (al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:5, no. 1); Abū Muḥammad **ʿAbd al-Raḥmān** b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd al-Rāzī **al-Dashtakī**, d. ?, high marks (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 4:73 f., no. 4755); **ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khubayb**, d. ?, known only from passing mention in biographies of his father and son (see Khubayb, below); **Abū Bakr Aḥmad** b. Jaʿfar b. Ḥamdān **b. Mālīk** al-Qaṭīʿī al-Ḥanbalī al-Baghdādī, d. 268/882, high marks, transmitted works of Ibn Ḥanbal (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 5:116 f., no. 1966); **Abū Jaʿfar ʿIsā** b. Abī ʿIsā Māhān **al-Rāzī** al-Tamīmī, d. ?, *mawlā*, also linked to Baṣra and Khurāsān, mixed marks tending to negative (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 7:328 f., no. 9484); **Abū ʿUmar** al-Qāsim b. Jaʿfar b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid **al-Hāshimī**, a Baṣran ʿAlid, d. 414/1024, *qāḍī*, respected transmitter (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 14:462 f., no. 6887); Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Manṣūr b. Sayyār al-Ramādī, d. 265/878, active in Baghdād, mixed marks tending to positive (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 6:362 f., no. 2856); Abū Masʿūd **Aḥmad b. al-Furāt** b. Khālīd al-Ḍabbī al-Rāzī, d. 258/872, major figure, well respected despite scattered dissent, settled at Isfahan (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 1:65 f., no. 117); Abu l-Ḥasan **ʿAlī b. Shayba** b. Ṣalt al-Sadūsī, d. 272/885, *mawlā*, Baṣran who lived in Baghdād for a time but settled in Egypt, good marks (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 13:393 f., no. 6285); **ʿAmr b. ʿAlī**, above; Abū l-ʿAbbās **al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān** b. ʿĀmir al-Shaybānī al-Nasawī, d. 303/915, the leading transmitter of Khurāsān in his day, high marks, heard the books of Ibn Abī Shayba from their author (al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkira*, 2:703 f., no. 724); Abū ʿAlī **Ḥusayn b. Naṣr** b. al-Muʿārik al-Baghdādī, d. 261/875, came to Egypt and transmitted there, respected – the Khaṭīb seems to have made two entries of this Ḥusayn, one of which stresses transmission from Yazīd, the other transmission to al-Ṭahāwī (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 8:723 f., no. 4190 f.); **al-Ḥusayn b. Ishāq** al-Daḥiqī **al-Tustarī**, d. 293/905, minor figure much cited by al-Ṭabarānī, peripatetic (al-Manṣūrī, *Irshād*, 280, no. 399); Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad, **Ibn al-Athram** al-Muqriʾ, d. 336/947–948, generally high marks, moved from Baghdād to Baṣra, where al-Hāshimī heard from him (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 2:80 f., no. 47); **Ishāq b. Rāhawayh**, above; Abu l-Ḥārith **Khubayb** b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khubayb al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī al-Madīnī, d. 132/749, narrated to Mālīk as well as Mustalim, minor, little-known transmitter (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 2:308 f., no. 2017); **Khubayb b. Yisāf/Isāf** b. ʿInaba b. ʿAmr al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī, d. during caliphate of ʿUthmān, little known save in connection with this story, Badr itself, and a few subsequent raids (Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, *Kitāb al-*

ṭabaqāt, edited by A.Ḍ. al-ʿUmarī (Riyadh: Dār Ṭayba, 1982), 106; Ibn Saʿd, above; al-Wāqidi, *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, 1: *passim*); Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān **Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Numayr** al-Hamdānī al-Khārifi al-Kūfi, d. 234/849, major figure, glowing marks, visit to Wāsiṭ expressly mentioned (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 25:566 ff., no. 5379); Abū ʿAmr **Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ḥamdān** al-Ḥirī, d. 376/987, *musnad Khurāsān*, major figure, high marks, transmission from al-Ḥasan at sixteen expressly mentioned (al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 16:356 ff., no. 254); Abu Jaʿfar **Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh** al-Jammāl al-Baghdādī, d. 346/958, travelled widely after *ḥadīth*, settled in Rayy, Nishapur, and Samarqand (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 4:354 f., no. 1538); Abū Bakr **Mukram b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad** al-Qāḍi al-Bazzāz, d. 345/956, minor figure, accounted reliable (al-Khaṭīb, *TMS*, 8:723 f., no. 4190 f.); **Mustalim b. Saʿīd** al-Thaqafi al-Wāsiṭī, d. ?, known more for ascetic exertion than *ḥadīth* transmission, in which he nevertheless took part competently (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 6:233 f., no. 7789); Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Sulaymān al-Ḥaḍramī al-Kūfi, **Muṭayyan**, d. 297/909, high marks, author of a *musnad* and *taʾrīkh* (al-Manṣūrī, *Irshād*, 579 f., no. 943); **Tamīm b. al-Muntaṣir b. Tamīm** al-Ḥāshimī al-Wāsiṭī, d. 244/858, *mawlā*, indifferent marks, grandfather of Baḥshal (see Sources below) (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb*, 1:484 f., no. 960); **ʿUthmān b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm**, Ibn **Abī Shayba** al-ʿAbsī al-Kūfi, d. 237/851, elder brother of Abū Bakr, also a major scholar (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 19:478 ff., no. 3857); Abū Muḥammad **ʿUbayd b. Ghannām b. Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth** al-Nakhaʿī al-Kūfi, d. 297/909, major transmitter from Ibn Abī Shayba and to al-Ṭabarānī (al-Manṣūrī, *Irshād*, 403 f., no. 626); Abū Khālīd **Yazīd b. Hārūn b. Zādhī/Zādhān** al-Sulamī al-Wāsiṭī, b. 117/735, d. 206/821, *mawlā*, a major, highly respected transmitter (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 32:261 ff., no. 7061); **Zuhayr b. Ḥarb**, above.

Sources

Abū Nuʿaym Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣbahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyāʾ*, 10 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī 1932–1938), 1:364 f.; Abū Nuʿaym Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣbahānī, *Maʾrifat al-ṣaḥāba*, edited by ʿĀ. al-ʿAzāzī (Riyadh: Dār al-Waṭan, 1998), 2:988, no. 2525 (this compiler was also aware of the report through Abū Jaʿfar that bypassed Yazīd b. Hārūn, calling it “abridged” [*mukhtaṣar*]); Aslam b. Sahl **Baḥshal**, *Taʾrīkh Wāsiṭ*, edited by K. ʿAwwād (Baghdād: Maṭbaʿat al-Maʾārif, 1967), 85; al-**Bayhaqī**, *Sunan*, 9:64, no. 17879; Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-**Bukhārī**, *al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, 9 vols. (Hyderabad: n.p., 1958–1964), 3:209, no. 715, whence by an *isnād* to Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb ghawāmiḍ al-asmāʾ*, 1:210; al-**Ḥākim** al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak*, 2:146, no. 2619; Aḥmad b. Zuhayr b. Ḥarb **Ibn Abī Khaythama**, *al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, edited by Ṣ. Hala, 2 vols. (Cairo: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadītha, 2006), 2:707, no. 2918; **Ibn Abī Shayba**, *al-*

Muṣannaf, 6:487, no. 33159; **Ibn Ḥanbal**, *Musnad*, 25:42, no. 15763, whence Ibn al-Jawzī, *Tahqīq*, 2:342, no. 1873; **Ibn Sa'd**, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt*, 3:496; **al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī**, *Muwaddih*, 1:209 f.; Muḥammad b. Hārūn al-Rūyānī, *Musnad al-Rūyānī*, edited by A. Abū Yamānī, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1995), 2:450, no. 1469; **al-Ṭabarānī**, *al-Muʿjam al-kabīr*, edited by Ḥ. al-Salafī, 25 vols. (n.p., 1984), 4:223, no. 4194; **al-Ṭaḥāwī**, *Sharḥ*, 413 f., no. 2577 f.

Cf.

- the colorful, detailed version via a combined *mursal isnād* (al-Wāqidi – Ibn Jurayj al-Makkī – Abān b. Šāliḥ al-Madanī – Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib al-Madanī [not a Companion]), lacking the distinctive phrasing of our three *ḥadīth*, in al-Wāqidi, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, 1:46 f.
- an abbreviated version without an *isnād* in Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, above
- a distinct *ḥadīth* alluding to the same incident, without names, and giving Muḥammad b. al-Sāʿib al-Kalbī al-Kūfī (d. 146/763) as ultimate authority (via Abū Yūsuf to al-Shaybānī, *Kitāb al-siyar*, 99, no. 42). The unique nature of this report, and the fact that culminates with al-Kalbī, make it impossible to relate to the other versions studied here – its wording is faintly reminiscent of al-Wāqidi's account (above).

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Marie Legendre, Petra Sijpesteijn, Michael Cook, Behnam Sadeghi, Harald Motzki, Amr Osman, and participants in the Princeton Islamic Studies Colloquium, particularly Dale Correa, for their comments on drafts of this essay.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Šanʿānī (d. 212/827). *al-Muṣannaf fi l-ḥadīth*. Edited by Ḥ. al-R. al-Aʿzamī. 10 vols. Beirut: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī, 1970–.
- Abū ʿAwāna Yaʿqūb b. Ishāq al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 312/924 or 5). *Musnad Abī ʿAwāna*. Edited by A. ʿĀ. al-Dimashqī. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, 1998.
- Abū Bakr b. al-Muqrīʾ al-Iṣbahānī (d. 381/991). *al-Muntakhab min gharāʾib aḥādīth Mālik b. Anas*. Edited by R. Būshāma. Riyadh: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1999.
- Abū Dāʾūd Sulaymān b. al-Ashʿath al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889). *Sunan Abī Dāʾūd*. Edited by M. al-Khālidi. 3 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiya, 1996.

- Abu l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 375/985). *Tafsīr al-Samarqandī*. Edited by 'A. Mu'awwad, et al. 3 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1993.
- Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d. 224/838). *Kitāb al-amwāl*. Edited by M. 'Umāra. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 1989.
- al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, Ḥasan b. Yūsuf (d. 726/1325). *Muntaha l-maṭlab fī taḥqīq al-madhhab*. 15 vols. Mashhad: al-Majma', 1991–2008.
- Badr al-Dīn al-'Aynī (d. 855/1451). *Maghānī al-akhyār fī sharḥ asāmī rijāl ma'ānī al-āthār*. Edited by A.M. al-Ṭayyib. 3 vols. Mecca: Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā, 1997.
- Baḥshal, Aslam b. Sahl (d. 292/904f.). *Ta'rikh Wāsiṭ*. Edited by K. 'Awwād. Baghdād: Maṭba'at al-Ma'ārif, 1967.
- al-Bayhaqī, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 458/1056). *al-Sunan al-kubrā*. Edited by M. 'Aṭā. 11 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1994.
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'il (d. 256/870). *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*. 9 vols. Hyderabad: n.p., 1958–1964.
- al-Dānī, Aḥmad b. Ṭāhir (d. 532/1138). *Kitāb al-īmā' ilā aṭrāf aḥādīth Kitāb al-muwatta'a*. Edited by 'A. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 5 vols. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 2003.
- al-Dāraquṭnī, 'Alī b. 'Umar (d. 385/995). *al-'Ilal*. Edited by M. al-Dabbāsī. 16 vols. al-Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2006.
- al-Dārimī, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 255/869). *Sunan al-Dārimī*. Edited by F. Zamarli, Kh. al-'Alamī. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1987.
- al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn (d. 748/1348). *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1969.
- al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn (d. 748/1348). *Sīyar a'lām al-nubalā'*. Edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūṭ, et al. 25 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1981–.
- al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 405/1014). *al-Mustadrak 'ala l-ṣaḥīḥayn*. 5 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1997.
- al-Ḥāzimī, Muḥammad b. Mūsā (d. 584/1200). *Kitāb al-i'tibār*. Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Majlis Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniya, 1940.
- Hishām b. 'Ammār, Abu l-Walīd al-Dimashqī (d. 245/859). *Ḥadīth Hishām b. 'Ammār*. Edited by M. Āl Ḥumayd. Riyadh: Dār Ishbīliya, 1999.
- Ibn Abī 'Āshim, Aḥmad b. 'Amr al-Ḍaḥḥāk (d. 287/900). *al-Āḥād wal-mathānī*. Edited by B.F. al-Jawābira. 6 vols. Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, 1991.
- Ibn Abī Khaythama, Aḥmad b. Zuhayr b. Ḥarb (d. 279/892). *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*. Edited by Ṣ. Halal. 2 vols. Cairo: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadītha, 2006.
- Ibn Abī Shayba, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad (d. 235/849). *al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fī-l-aḥādīth wa-l-āthār*. Edited by K.Y. al-Ḥūt. 7 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Tāj, 1989.
- Ibn 'Adī, 'Abd Allāh al-Jurjānī (d. 365/975 or 6). *al-Kāmil fī ḍu'afā' al-rijāl*. 7 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984.
- Ibn 'Asākir, 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan (d. 571/1176). *Ta'rikh madīnat Dimashq*. Edited by 'A. Shīrī. 80 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995–1998.

- Ibn Balabān, 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī b. al-Fārisī (d. 739/1339). *al-Ihsān fī taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt. 18 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1991.
- Ibn Bashkuwāl, Khalaf b. 'Abd al-Malik (d. 578/1183). *Kitāb ghawāmiḍ al-asmā' al-mubhama*. Edited by 'I. al-Sayyid and M. 'Izz al-Dīn. 2 vols. Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1987.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmad b. 'Alī (d. 852/1449). *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*. 7 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 2004.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad (d. 241/855). *Musnad al-imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal*. Edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt, N. al-'Irqūsī. 52 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1993–2008.
- Ibn Ḥazm, Abū Muḥammad 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Andalusī (d. 456/1064). *al-Muḥallā*. 11 vols. Cairo: Idārat al-Ṭibā'a al-Muniriya, 1929–1934.
- Ibn Jārūd, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī al-Naysābūrī (d. 307/919 or 20). *Kitāb al-muntaqā*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1996.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī (d. 597/1200). *al-Taḥqīq fī aḥādīth al-khilāf*. Edited by M. al-Sa'dānī. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1994–.
- Ibn Māja, Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Qazwīnī (d. 273/887). *al-Sunan*. Edited by Sh. al-Arna'ūt. 5 vols. Damascus: Dār al-Risāla al-'Ālamiya, 2009.
- Ibn al-Mundhir, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Naysābūrī (d. 318/930). *al-Awsaṭ fī l-sunan wa-l-ijmā' wa-l-ikhtilāf*. Edited by Ṣ. Ḥanīf. 6 vols (1–5, 11). Riyadh: Dār Ṭayba, 1999.
- Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113). *Dhakhīrat al-ḥuffūz*. Edited by 'A. al-Faryawā'ī. 5 vols. Riyadh: Dar al-Salaf, 1996.
- Ibn Qudāma, 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad (d. 620/1223). *al-Mughnī*. 15 vols. Cairo: Hajar, 1986–.
- Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad (d. 230/845). *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*. Edited by 'A.M. 'Umar. 11 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 2001.
- al-Iṣbahānī, Abū Nu'aym Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 430/1038). *Ḥilyat al-awliyā' wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā'*. 10 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1932–1938.
- al-Iṣbahānī, Abū Nu'aym Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 430/1038). *Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba*. Edited by 'Ā. al-'Azāzī. Riyadh: Dār al-Waṭan, 1998.
- Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh (d. 238/852). *Musnad*. Edited by 'A. al-Balūshī. 5 vols. Medina: Maktabat al-Imān, 1990–1995.
- al-Jahḍamī, Ismā'īl b. Iṣḥāq al-Azdī al-Qādī (d. 282/895). *al-Juz' al-khāmis min musnad Mālik b. Anas*. Edited by M. Muranyi. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2002.
- al-Jawhārī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 381/991). *Musnad al-Muwaṭṭa'*. Edited by L. al-Ṣaghīr, Ṭ. Būsariḥ. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1997.
- al-Jawraqānī, al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm (d. 543/1148). *al-Abāṭil wal-manākīr wal-ṣiḥāḥ wal-mashāhīr*. Edited by 'A. al-Faryawā'ī. 2 vols. Benares: Idārat al-Buḥūth al-Islāmīya, 1983.
- Khalīfa b. Khayyāt (d. 240/854). *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt*. Edited by A.Ḍ. al-'A. Ḍ. Riyadh: Dār Ṭayba, 1982.

- al-Khallāl, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 311/923). *Ahl al-mīlāl wal-ridḍa ... min Kitāb al-jāmiʿ*. Edited by I. b. Ḥ. b. Sulṭān. 2 vols. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1996.
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī (d. 463/1071). *Muwaddiḥ awhām al-jamʿ wa-l-tafriq*. Edited by ʿA.M. al-Qalʿajī. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, 1987.
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī (d. 463/1071). *Taʾriḫ madīnat al-salām (TMS)*. Edited by B. ʿA. Maʿrūf. 17 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001.
- al-Mizzī, Yūsuf b. al-Zakī (d. 742/1341). *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl*. Edited by B. ʿA. Maʿrūf. 35 vols. Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1992.
- Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī (d. 261/875). *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Edited by M.F. ʿAbd al-Bāqī. 5 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabīya, 1955–1956.
- al-Nasāʾī, Aḥmad b. Shuʿayb (d. 303/915). *Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā*. Edited by Sh. al-Arnaʿūt. 12 vols. Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 2001.
- al-Rūyānī, Muḥammad b. Hārūn (d. 307/919). *Musnad al-Rūyānī*. Edited by A. Abū Yamānī. 3 vols. Cairo: Muʿassasat Qurṭuba, 1995.
- al-Sahmī, Ḥamza b. Yūsuf (d. 427/1035 or 6). *Taʾriḫ Jurjān*. Hyderabad: Maṭbaʿat Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniya, 1950.
- Shaḥnūn b. Saʿīd al-Tanūkhī (d. 240/855). *al-Mudawwana al-kubrā*. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiya, 1994.
- al-Samhūdī, ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 891/1506). *Wafāʾ al-Wafā bi-akḥbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā*. Edited by Q. al-Sāmarrāʾī. 5 vols. London: Muʿassasat al-Furqān li-l-Turāth al-Islāmī, 2001.
- al-Sarakhsī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (d. 483/1090). *Sharḥ kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr*. Edited by Ṣ. al-Munajjid. 5 vols. Cairo: Maʿhad al-Makḥṭūṭāt bi-Jāmiʿat al-Duwal al-ʿArabīya, 1971–1972.
- al-Shāfiʿī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs (d. 204/820). *Kitāb al-Umm*, 2nd edition. Edited by M.Z. al-Najjār. 8 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, 1973.
- al-Shawkānī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (d. 1255/1839). *Nayl al-awṭār min aḥādīth sayyid al-akhḡār*. 9 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1973.
- al-Shaybānī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. 189/805). *Kitāb al-siyar li-l-Shaybānī*. Edited by M. Khaddūrī. Beirut: al-Dār al-Muttaḥida lil-Nashr, 1975.
- al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad (d. 360/971). *al-Muʿjam al-kabīr*. Edited by Ḥ. al-Salafī. 25 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1984.
- al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad (d. 360/971). *al-Muʿjam al-awsaṭ*. 10 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1995.
- al-Taḥāwī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 321/933). *Sharḥ mushkil al-āthār*. Edited by Sh. al-Arnaʿūt. 16 vols. Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1994.
- al-Thaʿlabī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 427/1035). *al-Kaṣḥf wa-l-bayān*. Edited by Abū Muḥammad b. ʿAshūr. 10 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2002.
- al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā (d. 279/892). *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*. 10 vols. Ḥims: Maṭābiʿ al-Fajr al-Ḥadītha, 1965–1968.

- al-Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. 'Umar (d. 207/822). *The Kitāb al-Maghāzī of al-Wāqidī*. Edited by M. Jones. 3 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- al-Zayla'ī, 'Abd Allāh b. Yūsuf (d. 762/1360 or 61). *Naṣb al-rāya takhrīj aḥādīth al-hidāya*. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiya, 1996.

Secondary Sources

- Beaumont, Daniel. "Hard-Boiled: Narrative Discourse in Early Muslim Traditions." *Studia Islamica* 83 (1996): 5–31.
- Bouderbala, Sobhi. "Les mawālī à Fustāṭ aux deux premiers siècles de l'islam et leur intégration sociale." In *Les dynamiques d'islamisation en Méditerranée centrale et en Sicile: Nouvelles propositions et découvertes récentes*, edited by A. Nef and F. Ardizzone, 103–117. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2014.
- Brown, J.A.C. Review of *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*, by G.H.A. Juynboll. *Journal of Islamic Studies* 19, no. 3 (2008): 391–397.
- Brown, Peter. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101.
- Caetani, Leone. *Annali dell'Islām*. 10 vols. Milan: Ulrico Hoepli, 1918.
- Crone, Patricia. *Slaves on Horses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Crone, Patricia. "The Early Islamic World" In *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, The Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, edited by K. Raaflaub and N. Rosenstein, 309–332. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1999.
- Crone, Patricia. "The Religion of the Qur'ānic Pagans: God and the Lesser Deities." *Arabica* 57, no. 2–3 (2010): 151–200.
- Donner, Fred. *Narratives of Islamic Origins*. Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1998.
- Donner, Fred. "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community." *al-Abḥath* 50–51 (2002–2003): 9–53.
- Donner, Fred. *Muhammad and the Believers: At the Origins of Islam*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Ess, Josef van. "Dāremī, Abū Sa'īd 'Othmān." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. 7. Edited by E. Yarshater, 31–32. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982–.
- Fattal, Antoine. *Le statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'islam*, 2nd edition. Beirut: Dar al-Machreq, 1995.
- Friedmann, Yohanan. "The Attitude of the Jam'iyyatī 'Ulama-I Hind to the Indian National Movement and the Establishment of Pakistan." In *Inventing Boundaries: Gender, Politics, and the Partition of India*, edited by Mushirul Hasan, 157–177. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Friedmann, Yohanan. *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Görke, Andreas and Gregor Schoeler. *Die Ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muḥammads: Das Korpus 'Urwa ibn az-Zubair*. Princeton: The Darwin Press, 2008.

- Günther, Sebastian. "Fictional Narration and Imagination within an Authoritative Framework." In *Story-telling in the Framework of Non-fictional Arabic Literature*, edited by S. Leder, 433–471. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998.
- Hinz, Walther. "Dhirā." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition. Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1825.
- Horowitz, Josef. "Abd Allāh b. Salām." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition. Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0063.
- Jandora, J.W. "Developments in Islamic Warfare: The Early Conquests." *Studia Islamica* 64 (1986): 101–113.
- Jones, J.M.B. "The Chronology of the 'Maghāzī': A Textual Survey." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19, no. 2 (1957): 245–280.
- Juynboll, Gauthier H.A. *Encyclopaedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kennedy, Hugh. *The Armies of the Caliphs: Military and Society in the Early Islamic State*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Khadduri, Majid. *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955.
- Landau-Tasseron, Ella. "Features in the Pre-Conquest Muslim Army in the Time of Muḥammad." In *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, vol. 3, *States, Resources, and Armies*, edited by A. Cameron, 299–336. Princeton: Darwin Press, 1995.
- Lecker, Michael. *The Constitution of Medina: Muḥammad's First Legal Document*. Princeton: Darwin Press, 2004.
- Lopez, Ariel. *Shenoute of Atripe and the Uses of Poverty*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2013.
- Loth, Otto. "Die Vulkanregionen (Ḥarra's) von Arabien nach Jākūt." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 22, no. 3 (1868): 365–382.
- Lucas, Scott. "Abu Bakr Ibn al-Mundhir, Amputation, and the Art of Ijtihad." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–368.
- al-Manṣūrī, Nāyif b. Ṣalāḥ. *Irshād al-qāṣī wal-dānī ilā tarājim shuyūkh al-Ṭabarānī*. Riyadh: Dār al-Kiyān, 2006.
- Motzki, Harald. "The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some Maghāzī Reports." In *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*, edited by H. Motzki, 170–239. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Motzki, Harald. "Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey." *Arabica* 52, no. 2 (2005): 204–253.
- Nagel, Tilman. *Mohammed: Leben und Legende*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2008.
- Paket-Chy, A., and C. Gilliot. "Works on hadith and its Codification, on Exegesis, and on Theology." In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, edited by C.E. Bosworth and M.S. Asimov, 91–132. 5 vols. Paris: UNESCO, 2000.

- al-Qāḍī, Wadād. "Non-Muslims in the Muslim Conquest Army in Early Islam." In *Christians and Others in the Umayyad State*, edited by A. Borrut and F. Donner, 83–128. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2016.
- Sadeghi, Behnam. "The Traveling Tradition Test: A Method for Dating Traditions." *Der Islam* 85, no. 1 (2010): 203–242.
- Schöller, Marco. *Exegetisches Denken und Prophetenbiographie: eine quellenkritische Analyse der Sīra-Überlieferung zu Muḥammads Konflikt mit den Juden*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998.
- al-Ṭurayqī, 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm. *al-Istī'āna bi-ghayr al-muslimīn fi l-fiqh al-islāmī*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1989.
- Watt, Montgomery. "'Abd Allāh b. Ubayy b. Salūl." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition. Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0065.