
Maghazi and the Muhaddithun: Reconsidering the Treatment of "Historical" Materials in Early Collections of Hadith

Author(s): Muhammad Qasim Zaman

Source: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Feb., 1996), pp. 1-18

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/176112>

Accessed: 30/03/2011 20:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of Middle East Studies*.

Muhammad Qasim Zaman

MAGHĀZĪ AND THE MUḤADDITHŪN:
RECONSIDERING THE TREATMENT OF
“HISTORICAL” MATERIALS IN EARLY
COLLECTIONS OF HADITH

I

Islamicists have long been interested in the historiography of the *sīra* and *maghāzī* literature. Ibn Ishaq's *Sīra* has been fruitfully compared with al-Waqidi's *Maghāzī*, and both have been compared with sections in al-Bukhari's *Ṣaḥīḥ* or with other collections of hadith.¹ It has often been observed that the materials constituting the *Sīra* of Ibn Ishaq or the *Maghāzī* of al-Waqidi—works which may for convenience, but only with reservations, be designated “historical”—are often the same as those preserved in collections of hadith such as al-Bukhari's. It has also been observed that what distinguish these materials from one another are essentially the former's narrative and chronological structures and the motives and methods governing these structures.² John Wansbrough, who has compared these texts, postulates as well a “development from loosely structured narrative to concise *exemplum* . . . [which] illustrates perfectly the stylistic difference between *Sīra* and sunna, between the mythic and normative preoccupations (*Geistesbeschäftigungen*) of early Muslim literature.”³

Whether Wansbrough is right in claiming so precise a “development” or “movement” from *sīra* to sunna—which, for him, means the movement from Ibn Ishaq through al-Waqidi to al-Bukhari—will not be examined here. Nor is it the purpose here to make another attempt at comparing Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, al-Tabari, and so on with one another or with any of the hadith texts. This essay seeks rather to argue that collections of hadith, some of which have substantial sections on *maghāzī* and other “historical” matters, should not be treated—as Wansbrough, for one, would seem to do—as a single, undifferentiated entity that can be compared with “historical” works as a unit, or of which al-Bukhari's collection can be considered a representative sample. There are in fact significant differences among various hadith collections in, for instance, the methods and purposes governing the selection and use of the *maghāzī* materials and in the contents of such materials themselves. It is the purpose of what follows to document some of these differences and to try to account for them.

Muhammad Qasim Zaman is a lecturer at the Quaid-i Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

2 Muhammad Qasim Zaman

This enquiry has implications for the study not only of hadith but also of early Islamic historiography and historical thought in general. Some of these are briefly worth stating here. The early *muḥaddithūn*'s handling of the *maghāzī* will be seen to shed considerable light on how they, as the emergent religious elite of Islamic societies, viewed some of the most crucial aspects of the earliest history of Islam, what they thought worth remembering about it, and what place and function such materials as they did preserve came to have in their collections of hadith. However, if anything of substance is to be learned about the *muḥaddithūn*, it must be grounded in the understanding that the literary strategies which they brought to bear on the materials in question differed quite markedly from one traditionist to another. Although "historical" materials in hadith will not be compared here with more conventional specimens of early Islamic historiography, this study should demonstrate that any attempt to make such a comparison will have to take account of the diversity of concerns, methods, and choices—and of the form and content—governing collections of hadith.

These collections do not constitute a monolithic corpus any more than does the Arabic historical tradition itself. That works of a particular genre can and often do differ quite significantly from one another in how they treat their subject matter and to what end, even as they discuss the same subjects or handle similar materials, is a realization that has been slow in coming to many areas of Islamic studies.⁴ Without such a recognition, however, interpreting the meaning and significance of particular texts, their relationship to works of the same or other genres, and judgments about their place in Islamic historiography or intellectual history—if not about that historiography or history itself—may often prove to be quite misleading.

II

Materials pertaining to, or having something to do with, the *maghāzī* are part of all major collections of hadith; a separate *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* is, however, found in only a few. Collections that do have independent "books" on *maghāzī* include the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq ibn Hammam al-Sanʿani (d. 826),⁵ the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abi Shayba (d. 849),⁶ and the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhari (d. 870).⁷ This essay will be limited to a study of the *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* in each of these three early collections. Although materials bearing on *maghāzī* are often found in different contexts and under various headings in the same collection of hadith, we shall be concerned only with such materials as are part of a *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* itself.

Of the "books" of *maghāzī* being considered here, ʿAbd al-Razzaq's purports to be the earliest, followed by those of Ibn Abi Shayba and al-Bukhari. Although the former two are each part of a *Muṣannaf* now, it is not entirely certain that they have always been such. Much of ʿAbd al-Razzaq's *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* may have come from a similarly titled and now lost work of Maʿmar ibn Rashid (d. 770), as Motzki has noted;⁸ but the indebtedness to Maʿmar scarcely precludes the possibility that this material, as transmitted by ʿAbd al-Razzaq, was perhaps from the outset also a part of the latter's *Muṣannaf*.⁹ The *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* of Ibn Abi Shayba seems, for its part, to be very similar in content to, if not identical with, his *Taʾrīkh*. The latter work is extant in manuscript and has been briefly described by H. Schützinger.¹⁰

The *Taʾrikh* may have originated, and continued to exist, as a separate work, even as it was being included in Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Muṣannaf* as the *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*. Whether the latter was part of the *Muṣannaf* from the start or became so at some later stage is not known.¹¹ Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Muṣannaf* also has a *Kitāb al-Taʾrikh*, but it is concerned exclusively with certain military campaigns and conquests in the years following the Prophet’s death and apparently bears little resemblance to the contents of the Berlin manuscript of the *Taʾrikh* as described by Schützinger.¹²

Now, whether or not the *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq and of Ibn Abi Shayba originally formed part of their *Muṣannafs* is of rather less importance than the fact that they came to be regarded as such at some stage. That they were so regarded is hardly surprising, for insofar as a distinction between *muḥaddithūn* and *akhbāriyyūn* can be made at all,¹³ the work of both our compilers is to be reckoned among the former rather than the latter. Much of Ibn Abi Shayba’s materials also come from *muḥaddithūn*, as do ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s: Maʿmar, to whom the latter is so thoroughly indebted, and al-Zuhri (d. 742)—a principal source used by Maʿmar—were both among the most distinguished of the early scholars not only of *maghāzī* materials but of hadith in general. The *maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba are different in many important respects from that of al-Bukhari, as well as from each other, as this essay will show; nevertheless, they do represent the selection, ordering, and presentation of materials from a traditionist’s perspective, and lend themselves to analysis as hadith texts. A closer look at these materials should illustrate this point.

III

Al-Bukhari’s *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* is a more or less chronological ordering of the military campaigns of the Prophet in Medina.¹⁴ Beginning with a tradition that refers to the *ghazwa* of al-ʿUshayra,¹⁵ a tradition whose sole interest seems to be to ascertain the exact number of the Prophet’s expeditions and to determine (although not date) the first of them, al-Bukhari quickly proceeds to list traditions having something to do with the battle of Badr, the first major military engagement between the Prophet and his Meccan opponents. Traditions about subsequent expeditions or military encounters of the Prophet, or about other major episodes in the Medinan period of his career, are arrayed in sequence, and the *kitāb* ends with a section on the last illness and death of the Prophet.

The *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* in the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abi Shayba, a collection that purports to be older than al-Bukhari’s, also follows, if with important lapses, a generally chronological sequence. But the scope of Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Maghāzī* is much wider than al-Bukhari’s. The former’s text begins with “the affair of the elephant” immediately before the birth of the Prophet, and shows considerable interest in the Meccan period of his life. The earlier sections comprise traditions (in this order) about some of the portents of Muhammad’s prophethood, the beginnings of his mission, the Meccan persecution, the “night journey” (*al-miʿrāj*), and the conversion of some of those who were later to be among his prominent companions. Traditions about the migration of certain persecuted Muslims from Mecca to Abyssinia and the disquisition on Islam by one of these refugees in the court of the ruler there are

reported after traditions about the Prophet's migration to Medina, and traditions about the letters Muhammad is supposed to have written to Chosroes, Caesar, and other foreign rulers to summon them to Islam come between the account of the conversion of prominent companions and the traditions regarding Abyssinia. Now, if such "historical" works as the *Sīra* of Ibn Ishaq and the *Taʾrīkh* of al-Tabari, and so on are any indication, this sequence would seem to be very awkward. But then, Ibn Abi Shayba does not claim that his is a historical sequence. The awkwardness of the sequence is striking, not because hadith collections are known for considerations of chronology (a point to which we shall return), but because Ibn Abi Shayba's ordering of the material on the Medinan phase of the Prophet's career does defer to a conventional, if implicit, chronological framework.

The topics Ibn Abi Shayba covers for the Medinan period of the Prophet's life are comparable, as is their sequence, to those in al-Bukhari. There are very significant differences between the two works in content and, apparently, in purpose, however, and these will be discussed later. But even in the range of topics, Ibn Abi Shayba again goes much further than al-Bukhari was to venture. For the former's *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* does not end with the death of the Prophet but, rather, includes traditions in sequence about the caliphates of all four of the Prophet's immediate successors. Quite apart from their inherent interest, these traditions' presence in this context is significant for being yet another indication that the scope of early works of *maghāzī* was not necessarily limited to the career of the Prophet.¹⁶

ʿAbd al-Razzaq's *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* shares some of the broad range of Ibn Abi Shayba's *Maghāzī* but very little of the latter's organization. It begins with traditions about certain events preceding the birth of Muhammad (e.g., the digging of the well of Zamzam by his grandfather) and, in what is a fairly coherent narrative, gives an account of the early life of Muhammad until and including the beginnings of his mission. But without any apparent indication of continuity, or awareness of the lack of it, the next section concerns itself with the episode of Hudaibiyya, and the one which follows it goes back to the battle of Badr. If there is a pattern in the way topics are juxtaposed, it is not self-evident, although it is fairly certain that considerations of chronological sequence are not foremost among the compiler's concerns.¹⁷ The variety of topics in ʿAbd al-Razzaq's *Maghāzī* is striking, however. Apart from those concerned with the Prophet's life and career, there are exegetical traditions about aspects of pre-Islamic "salvation history," so to speak—about the *aṣḥāb al-ukhdūd*, the *aṣḥāb al-kahf*, and the building of the *bayt al-maqdis*. There are also traditions about certain episodes of Muslim history in the post-Muhammadan period.¹⁸

Implicit in this survey of the organization of materials in the compilations of al-Bukhari, Ibn Abi Shayba, and ʿAbd al-Razzaq is the assumption that they acquired their present shape at the hands of their putative compilers. This may not necessarily be the case. "[B]ooks were originally the product of followers, not masters," Calder says of the early *fiqh* works.¹⁹ This is a judgment he would be perfectly willing to extend to early collections of hadith.²⁰ It is therefore possible that the seemingly arbitrary juxtaposition of traditions in ʿAbd al-Razzaq's *Maghāzī* is no more the compiler's fault (if it is a fault at all) than that some deference to a chronological framework by Ibn Abi Shayba and al-Bukhari is the achievement of either. But the organization of the material in the master's "notebooks" need not have differed

greatly from what it came to be in "finished works," the "real books,"²¹ disseminated later. Calder's suggestion that "works like the *Ṣaḥīḥ*s of [al-]Bukhārī and Muslim should probably be recognized as emerging into final form at least one generation later than the dates recorded for the deaths of their putative authors"²² seems to take too mechanical a view of the stabilization of texts, but even if his suggestion is followed, we would still have to account for the peculiarities of form and content which particular texts (as "finished works") exhibit. The concern here is not with dating texts or with determining when they emerged as "finished works"; it is only with examining what distinguishes one text of hadith from another and what such differences can tell us about the strategies governing each. These differences would remain worth examining whether the hadith texts in question had stabilized by the time their putative authors died or had become such at the hands of their pupils. The peculiarities of the texts under consideration here may now be illustrated with some specific examples.

IV

Badr

The basic content of several traditions about the battle of Badr is common to the *maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq, Ibn Abi Shayba, and al-Bukhari. All three compilations have traditions about the slaying of Abu Jahl, the quintessential unbeliever. They also show varying degrees of interest in those taken prisoner at Badr, contain exegetical traditions, and have much else in common. So too with many of the tendencies which particular traditions embody. Al-Bukhari's interest in matters doctrinal and theological becomes clear in the very first tradition about Badr, which has a predestinationist tendency,²³ and is in evidence throughout his *Maghāzī*. A concern with juridical matters is also prominent, although in this respect, and at least for Badr, Ibn Abi Shayba's material is of equal, if not greater, interest.

The juridical questions on which Ibn Abi Shayba and al-Bukhari provide material are, with some overlapping, rather different. The primary concern of the former seems to be with questions of booty, the treatment of prisoners, the amount of ransom demanded for them, and so forth. For his part, al-Bukhari is concerned, much more than is Ibn Abi Shayba, with attesting to the religious merit that participation in the battle of Badr assured to the companions. Those who had taken part in it came to be regarded as the best of Muslims; the social, and juridical, significance of such an estimation was that these men were later entitled to the highest stipends in the *dīwān*, which was established by ʿUmar during his caliphate.²⁴ To underscore, perhaps, the significance of the men involved, al-Bukhari concludes the section on Badr with a list of names; this is not an exhaustive list of all the participants, however, but one limited to those who have already figured in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*'s traditions relating to Badr (*man summiya min ahl Badr fīʾl-Jāmiʿ*).²⁵ The presence of this list here and the principle of selection governing it are both of some interest, but more striking is its initial order. The list begins with the Prophet and then names all four of the Rashidun caliphs, in the order in which they succeeded the Prophet and one another. What is evidently being asserted here is not only that, of all of the participants in the battle of Badr, these four companions are of the highest religious stature but

also that the order of their succession is the order of their religious merit. Both assertions were distinctive of early Sunnism and have remained so.²⁶

Al-Bukhari's list also draws attention to a fundamental and distinctive feature of his method. Its governing principle (one not peculiar to his material on Badr) is to bring together all kinds of disparate traditions bearing on matters of doctrine, juristic import, *faḍā'il*, and so forth, not because they are in any sense integral or even relevant to the "historical" event of Badr, but only because one or another of the Prophet's companions, who appears in these traditions, was present at Badr. The *narratio* of "historical" works has not simply given way here to exemplum. Exempla certainly pervade the traditions, but—in the case of the material on Badr, at least—they are not necessarily derived from, dependent on, or even related to some prior narrative about Badr. The reason such exempla are found in this context is only that the people with reference to whom they are articulated had participated in the battle of Badr.

The case is rather different with the traditions regarding Badr in the *maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba. The former's account is brief and—compared with the themes touched upon in Ibn Abi Shayba's traditions—limited in scope, but the bulk of it (reported with the *isnād*: Maʿmar [ibn Rashid]–Ayyub [ibn Abi Tamima]–ʿIkrima) takes the form of a continuous and coherent tradition with a certain unity, a beginning and an end. That is, ʿAbd al-Razzaq's *Maghāzī* may broadly be deemed to have a narrative structure.²⁷ In contrast, Ibn Abi Shayba's account is fragmented into frequently overlapping and discontinuous traditions that are not necessarily sequential. But if his traditions lack a narrative structure, they are not devoid of what F. R. Ankersmit has characterized as "narrative substance"—namely, "statements [in terms of which] . . . an 'image' or 'picture' of the past . . . is constructed."²⁸ Ibn Abi Shayba's *Maghāzī* is hardly an exercise in history *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* ("as it actually happened"). For all their discontinuity, however, his traditions do afford an "image" of Badr; the "image" is obviously incomplete in comparison, for example, to what Ibn Abi Shayba himself must have known of the "history" of Badr, but it is presumably sufficient to enable him to articulate the various juristic and dogmatic concerns he has in view. For Ibn Abi Shayba, Badr is not simply a point of reference, as it is in the case of al-Bukhari, for which quite disparate traditions can be grouped together. It is the subject of a *narratio*, composed mostly of traditions that are directly related to the event of Badr or its significance.²⁹ Disparate traditions can, in al-Bukhari, be juxtaposed because they are meaningful and significant in themselves, not as a function of their context. They may collectively underscore the significance of Badr or of the men who participated in the battle, but the meaning of these traditions remains intrinsic to them and would seem to be little affected by their inclusion in this or any other context. The contrast here with Ibn Abi Shayba's traditions may be illustrated with the familiar example of certain pro-ʿAbbas, or pro-ʿAbbasid, tendencies in the traditions about Badr.

Al-ʿAbbas, an uncle of the Prophet and the ancestor of the ʿAbbasid dynasty (750–1258), had fought in the battle of Badr on the side of the polytheists. That he had remained a polytheist, or at least had sided with those who held that belief, did not accord well with ʿAbbasid legitimist claims, which hinged both on al-ʿAbbas's

close kinship with the Prophet and on stories about his early commitment to the nascent faith. Where there was much other rewriting of early Islamic history, some effort was also expended to make the position of al-^ʿAbbas more amenable to the interests and aspirations of the ruling house. Traditions glorifying him were brought into circulation; those unfavorable to him were suppressed, among others by Ibn Hisham in his recension of Ibn Ishaq's *Sira*.³⁰ Not all traditions about al-^ʿAbbas need be tendentious; that many are, and especially those that betray an ^ʿAbbasid legitimist agenda in emphasizing his kinship with the Prophet or otherwise extoll him, is very likely.

The only tradition regarding al-^ʿAbbas in al-Bukhari's section on Badr describes the Prophet's firm refusal to treat him any differently from the other prisoners in the matter of ransom.³¹ ^ʿAbd al-Razzaq, too, has a single tradition about al-^ʿAbbas; this tradition, which is not part of his main narrative, reports that the Prophet was unable to sleep because al-^ʿAbbas—who had been taken prisoner at Badr—was in pain, and that it was only after al-^ʿAbbas's chains had been loosened that the Prophet could find some comfort.³² In contrast to the one, isolated tradition that al-Bukhari and ^ʿAbd al-Razzaq each preserve, Ibn Abi Shayba's traditions have greater variety and leave little doubt about the ideological commitments of the compiler. One tradition reports that it was through the agency of an angel that al-^ʿAbbas was captured, for all that the Ansari who brought him as a prisoner to the Prophet thought that it was he who had accomplished the deed.³³ (This report not only confirms the presence and role of angels during the battle—a point of manifest exegetical interest—but may also be read as illustrative of al-^ʿAbbas's special position: after all, only an angel was able, or fit, to capture him.) Another tradition reports the Prophet's instructions immediately before the battle that members of the Banu Hashim—the Prophet's own clan—in the enemy camp were not to be killed, for the unbelievers had coerced them into fighting against the Muslims.³⁴ Yet another tradition depicts al-^ʿAbbas demanding some favorable treatment from his captor for being the uncle of the Prophet.³⁵ Finally, a curious tradition has al-^ʿAbbas, as a prisoner, giving an unsolicited but sound legal opinion to the Prophet on the basis of Q.8:7³⁶—a tradition which serves to confirm what some of the others insinuate: that is, that al-^ʿAbbas was already a Muslim, that he had fought on the side of the polytheists only under coercion, and that he was intimately acquainted with the contents of divine revelation.

Ibn Abi Shayba is evidently not uncomfortable with the fact that al-^ʿAbbas had fought on the side of the polytheists and been captured by the Muslims. Rather, it is precisely in acknowledging this otherwise inconvenient fact that his traditions exhibit some of that decidedly pro-^ʿAbbas or pro-^ʿAbbasid color, which accords so well both with the ruling dynasty's legitimist concerns and with what is otherwise known of Ibn Abi Shayba's association with the promotion of those concerns.³⁷ That Ibn Abi Shayba's traditions can unambiguously reflect a pro-^ʿAbbasid agenda is not simply a function of their content, however; it is by virtue of the narrative context in which they are embedded that these traditions cease to be discrete units and become meaningful as an ensemble.³⁸ The traditions are not just some *faḍāʾil* of al-^ʿAbbas, unrelated to Badr and to each other, and presented here simply because al-^ʿAbbas is known to have participated in that battle.³⁹ Their effectiveness,

even their meaning, is enhanced by, if not contingent on, their context, Badr, of which these traditions make up one distinct and prominent theme. They are therefore integral to the way Ibn Abi Shayba chooses to recount the “history” of Badr.

Hudaybiyya

The difference between the traditions of al-Bukhari and those of Ibn Abi Shayba and ʿAbd al-Razzaq is perhaps nowhere as stark as in what they have to say about Hudaybiyya. A schematic representation of the contents of each would probably give a better sense of this difference than would highlighting some of their peculiarities, as we did for the material on Badr.

Al-Bukhari is concerned almost exclusively with juristic and theological matters and in general with such aspects of normative precedent as might be located in or attached to Hudaybiyya. The following is an outline of his material:⁴⁰

1. a theological tradition about some of the concomitants of right belief in God;
2. a miracle of the Prophet at Hudaybiyya: increase in the supply of drinking water;
3. a tradition on the penalty for shaving the head before performing the lesser pilgrimage (ʿumra);
4. the caliph ʿUmar’s showing special consideration to a woman whose father had been present at Hudaybiyya;
5. the nature of the oath pledged to the Prophet at Hudaybiyya;
6. prohibition of the flesh of domesticated donkeys;
7. an exegetical tradition about the revelation of Q.48:1, believed to refer to Hudaybiyya;
8. two “historical” traditions: one about the Prophet’s consulting his companions about the proper course of action to be adopted when informed that the Quraysh would not allow them to proceed to Mecca; the other about the treaty between the Quraysh and the Muslims;
9. Ibn ʿUmar’s following the sunna of the Prophet in the matter of sacrificial animals when he too was unable to proceed to Mecca for pilgrimage on account of the (second) *fitna*;
10. an explanation of why Ibn ʿUmar preceded ʿUmar in pledging the oath of loyalty to the Prophet at Hudaybiyya;
11. an anti-*raʿy* comment by one of those present at the battle of Siffin, recalling the escape of Abu Jandal to the Prophet’s camp at Hudaybiyya and the Prophet’s handing him back over to the Quraysh; and
12. a tradition about the Prophet’s severely punishing the treachery of some tribesmen after his return from Hudaybiyya.

The following are the major components of Ibn Abi Shayba’s account of Hudaybiyya:⁴¹

1. an exegetical tradition *ad* Q.48:1;
2. a detailed tradition about the prelude to the treaty between the Quraysh and the Muslims (the former sending several emissaries to the latter; negotiations between the two parties; dis-

cussions among the Quraysh); the refusal of the Quraysh’s emissary to refer to Muhammad in the document of agreement as “the Prophet of God,” and Muhammad’s agreeing to this objection; the terms of the treaty;

3. the unhappiness of Muslims with the terms of the treaty;
4. ʿAli’s unwillingness to erase the reference in the document to Muhammad’s being the Prophet of God; Muhammad erasing it himself;
5. traditions about the lesser pilgrimage in the following year; the verses revealed on that occasion;
6. an exegetical tradition about Hudaybiyya *ad* Q.48:1;
7. ʿUmar’s consternation at the terms of the treaty;
8. another tradition about the refusal of the Quraysh’s emissary to refer to Muhammad as the Prophet of God in the document;
9. another tradition about the prelude to the treaty and the terms of the treaty;
10. an exegetical tradition about the oath pledged to the Prophet at Hudaybiyya *ad* Q.48:18;
11. a miracle of the Prophet: increase in the supply of drinking water;
12. another detailed, comprehensive tradition about the entire episode of Hudaybiyya: the Muslims prevented from proceeding to Mecca; negotiations among various emissaries of the Quraysh and the Muslims; discussions among the Quraysh; the treaty; ʿUmar’s consternation; the escape of Abu Jandal and Muhammad’s handing him over to the Quraysh; the Prophet’s sacrificing victims at Hudaybiyya; a concluding report about the share given to the *ahl al-Hudaybiyya* from the spoils of Khaybar;
13. traditions about the Prophet’s blessing those who had performed the ritual of shaving their heads at Hudaybiyya; and
14. an exegetical tradition *ad* Q.48:1.

ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s account of the episode of Hudaybiyya⁴² essentially corresponds to one of Ibn Abi Shayba’s more detailed traditions (no. 12, in the schema of his contents). The two are not identical, however. A look at the *isnāds* of the two accounts (ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s: Maʿmar–al-Zuhri–ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubayr–Miswar ibn Makhrama and Marwan ibn al-Hakam; Ibn Abi Shayba’s: Khalid ibn Makhlad–ʿAbd al-Rahman ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAziz al-Ansari–Ibn Shihab [al-Zuhri]–ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubayr) is itself instructive. ʿUrwa and al-Zuhri are “common links,”⁴³ although ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s *isnād* is technically superior to Ibn Abi Shayba’s. That the latter’s tradition is not transmitted through Maʿmar, as ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s is, also raises the question—which must remain unsettled here—whether the differences in ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s transmission are due to Maʿmar, to ʿAbd al-Razzaq himself, or to some other circumstances of origin and transmission.

The differences between the two traditions under discussion here are not quite momentous, but they are numerous and significant. A few examples should suffice. First, Budayl ibn Warqaʾ al-Khuzaʿi, in reporting to the Quraysh his conversation with Muhammad at Hudaybiyya, refers to him as *hādha’l-rajul* in ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s tradition but as *rasūl Allah* in Ibn Abi Shayba’s. Second, ʿUmar’s sharp reaction is

related in Ibn Abi Shayba to the terms of the treaty; in ʿAbd al-Razzaq, it is related to the Prophet’s decision to return Abu Jandal to the unbelievers. Third, the story of Abu Basir immediately follows the reference to Abu Jandal in Ibn Abi Shayba but is, in much greater detail, the concluding part of ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s tradition. And fourth, an exegetical tradition (*ad* Q.60:10) about ʿUmar divorcing two of his unbelieving wives precedes the story of Abu Basir in ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s tradition; it is absent in Ibn Abi Shayba.⁴⁴

Even without taking account of the numerous variant readings, these examples should give some sense of the differences in two versions of what seems to be essentially the same tradition. Which of the two is closer to an “original” is impossible to say. Both also differ from traditions preserved with the same common links in “historical” works. Finally, several others of Ibn Abi Shayba’s traditions on Hudaybiyya do not accord in their details with this tradition.

As for the differences between the traditions of Ibn Abi Shayba and those of al-Bukhari, the outline of the principal contents of each, given at the beginning of this section, should suffice as an illustration. A historical content, and therefore a historical interest, is far more in evidence in the accounts of Ibn Abi Shayba and ʿAbd al-Razzaq than in the traditions of al-Bukhari. That “precedent” is “idealized and *hence shorn of its historical dimension*” in what Wansbrough characterizes as the “*sunna-ḥadīth literature*”⁴⁵ is a generalization that holds for al-Bukhari’s materials but cannot be sustained as regards ʿAbd al-Razzaq or Ibn Abi Shayba. Al-Bukhari does seem to presuppose a narrative (or narratives) of Hudaybiyya; but his traditions do not themselves constitute one. They are rather more directly related to Hudaybiyya than many of al-Bukhari’s traditions on Badr were related to that event. Yet, they are not *about* Hudaybiyya: Hudaybiyya is relevant to them (or they to it) solely because it was on that occasion that certain significant doctrinal and juristic matters were enunciated or precedents established. Ibn Abi Shayba’s traditions, in contrast, may be viewed as representing a traditionist’s decision about what is worth remembering about Hudaybiyya. Something similar can also be said of ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s account.

The Legitimacy of Authority

Unlike the *maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba, al-Bukhari’s *maghāzī* end with the death of the Prophet. In the section dealing with the Prophet’s death, al-Bukhari does recount traditions, however, that seek clearly to legitimize the succession of Abu Bakr.⁴⁶ Other traditions make the point (evidently with Shiʿi beliefs in view) that the Prophet did not make a *waṣīyya* although he may have wanted to,⁴⁷ and one tradition is explicit in denying the Shiʿi claim to a testament in favor of ʿAlī.⁴⁸

ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba recount traditions not only about the Prophet’s last illness and death, but also about his succession and several other, later events. The former’s traditions range wider, however. ʿAbd al-Razzaq has traditions about some of the governors of Syria and Iraq in the period of the Rashidun, about some early Islamic conquests, about the conflict of ʿAlī and Muʿawiya, and about the marriage of Fatima and ʿAlī.⁴⁹ Ibn Abi Shayba’s traditions are limited to the four Rashidun caliphs.

Striking in both ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba is the overriding concern with affirming the legitimacy of authority in the period following the Prophet's death. The image that the traditions of each help to construct is very close to the "orthodox" Sunni view of early Islamic history: the succession of Abu Bakr was prefigured in several indications given by the Prophet prior to his death; ʿUmar's own testimony is invoked to report and justify the proceedings at the Saqifa bani Sāʿida, where Abu Bakr's election had taken place; ʿAli, who is said to have been initially reluctant to recognize the caliphate of Abu Bakr, is quoted to pronounce on the religious merit of the first two caliphs; several traditions suggest that the choice of ʿUthman as ʿUmar's successor was never in doubt, and so forth.

While ʿAbd al-Razzaq and Ibn Abi Shayba have much common material on these and other matters, the latter's organization and presentation of material is again of very considerable significance—assuming, of course, that this organization is his rather than that of a later redactor of his material. As noted already, Ibn Abi Shayba has traditions about the caliphate of all four of the Rashidun; he limits his material to these and organizes it in accordance with the historical sequence of their succession. The significance of this is that by the time of Ibn Abi Shayba's death in 849, a Sunni "orthodoxy" was still very much in the making; it was not generally accepted, for instance, that ʿAli was a legitimate caliph, much less that he was comparable to his predecessors.⁵⁰ Traditionalist circles in Kufa and Basra did, however, recognize ʿAli as a caliph, and those of Kufa even gave him precedence over ʿUthman,⁵¹ although in general his position remained rather ambivalent among the early Sunnis.⁵² If Ibn Abi Shayba's scheme of organization is any indication of his commitments, it would seem that in placing ʿAli in the fourth place he is not only deferring to considerations of historical sequence but also implicitly affirming the view—which was to become the standard Sunni view—that this sequence also reflects the hierarchy of religious merit. ʿAli is therefore inferior to ʿUthman but a legitimate caliph nonetheless and, in fact, a member of the select company his predecessors comprised. These caliphs are nowhere designated in this material as the "Rashidun," but the fact that they are set apart for all others and presented as the rightful successors of the Prophet does speak for their uniqueness, their exclusive religious merit. The organization of Ibn Abi Shayba's material may, in fact, be taken not only as reflecting the emergent Sunni "orthodox" view as regards the Rashidun but also as contributing to the articulation of that view. Ibn Abi Shayba need not, of course, have contributed to the Sunni worldview only, or even primarily, through this collection of hadith. As already noted, he is also known to have narrated traditions publicly and to have done so on the bidding of the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Mutawakkil (r. 847–861). It is not unlikely that in narrating traditions, he would have disseminated a worldview essentially similar to the one that emerges from his *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*.

So much for the organization of Ibn Abi Shayba's material. As regards the content, one example—the traditions pertaining to ʿUthman—should suffice to indicate some of the concerns and choices governing this traditionist's selection of material. Three themes are prominent in the traditions about ʿUthman. The first is ʿUthman's legitimacy: during the caliphate of ʿUmar, people already were convinced that ʿUthman would be the next caliph,⁵³ and the Prophet himself had indicated that in

the approaching *fitna* ʿUthman and his associates would be on the right path.⁵⁴ The second theme is ʿUthman’s refusal to abdicate⁵⁵; and the third is his, and others’, warning of disunity and civil strife in the event of his murder.⁵⁶

The latter two themes in particular are scarcely unusual in materials our sources preserve on ʿUthman and the *fitna*. Ibn Abi Shayba’s account is of greater interest in what it omits, however, than in what it preserves. There is no word here of the grievances against ʿUthman, no effort to explain what may have motivated his murder.⁵⁷ Ibn Abi Shayba may well have assumed that his audience was acquainted with the context and causes of this event and that he could, therefore, omit them. However, and this seems rather more likely, he may purposely have left out the rebels’ grievances and their allegations of ʿUthman’s failings. ʿUthman’s murder remains unexplained in Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Maghāzī*, and no need is felt to try to exonerate him—or the community at large—from any blemish, for there is no sense of a blemish at all. There is the warning of course, from ʿUthman and others, that his murder would inaugurate unending disunity and *fitna*, but it remains unintelligible who wanted to kill him and why. All the same, a strong sense is conveyed that the caliph was completely innocent and that the community at large was not involved in—and therefore its rectitude was not compromised by—this *fitna*.

Ibn Abi Shayba’s peculiar choice of traditions regarding ʿUthman is probably not so much a reflection of orthodox bewilderment at the events of the first civil war in Islam as an apparently conscious decision regarding what is worth remembering about ʿUthman from a traditionist’s perspective. For he does bring forth some material on aspects of the civil war, although not as part of the *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*. His *Muṣannaf* has a brief *Kitāb al-Jamal*, too, of which one subsection has traditions about Siffin and another about the Khawarij. It is in this “book” that the civil war is treated at some length.⁵⁸ For all its interest, the contents of this collection will not be reviewed here. Two things may nevertheless be noted. First, the perspective is again, unsurprisingly, that of a traditionist: this is not a “history” of the first civil war, only a selection of some traditions which (despite an occasionally discordant note) seem to have, and seek to further, a definite agenda. Second, these traditions seek to answer some of those questions which subsequent generations kept asking about the religious status of the Prophet’s companions who were embroiled in this conflict—questions which had to be settled before an “orthodox” Sunni view of early Islam could crystallize. Thus, it is emphasized, for instance, that while both sides in the conflict—at Jamal as well as Siffin—were Muslims (and not ordinary Muslims, for that matter), participants on neither side became “unbelievers” on account of their involvement. ʿAli fought his opponents on both occasions as Muslims, and his treatment of the vanquished at Jamal was guided by the same recognition.⁵⁹ Then there are traditions about the strong sense of remorse on the part of some of the principal actors in this drama.⁶⁰ There is a sense, of course, that the pristine purity of the early days of Islam is irrevocably lost with this *fitna*.⁶¹ But expressions of regret attributed to certain participants may also be taken, perhaps, to exonerate them of some of their guilt. In short, a similar nascent Sunni vision guides both the *Maghāzī* and the *Kitāb al-Jamal* of Ibn Abi Shayba. This is a vision predicated on the enduring righteousness of the community: the four immediate successors of the Prophet were all legitimate caliphs; ʿUthman was unjustly murdered, but

his murder did not compromise the virtue of the community at large; and some of those involved in the first *fitna* may have erred, but they repented and are not to be criticized.

v

As noted at the outset, it has not been the purpose here to compare the *maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzaq, Ibn Abi Shayba, and al-Bukhari with the “historical” tradition (Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, etc.) or with other collections of hadith. The three collections studied here suffice, however, to make the point that so far as *maghāzī* materials are concerned, any one collection of hadith—al-Bukhari’s, for instance—cannot be taken as representative of the rest or as typical of what hadith collections in general have to offer on the *maghāzī*. By the same token, there seems little justification to posit, with Wansbrough, a direct development from Ibn Ishaq through al-Waqidi to al-Bukhari. Martin Hinds has already expressed some dissatisfaction with that view. He proposes that the transition was not simply from *sīra* to *sunna*, as Wansbrough would have it, but from “*maghāzī* to *sunna* via *siyar* and then *sīra*.”⁶² Hinds does not seem to have developed the point further,⁶³ and even though he suggests a more complex development than Wansbrough, his is unfortunately not a strikingly clear formulation. And it is, *inter alia*, open to the same objection as Wansbrough’s view, for however he conceives of the “passage” from *maghāzī* to *sunna* (the latter as enshrined, we may take it, in collections of hadith), Hinds still seems to take an essentially undifferentiated view of the latter. But collections of hadith can differ quite markedly from one another in their *maghāzī* materials, as the foregoing has indicated. Hadith texts such as those analyzed in this essay are certainly worth comparing with the “historical” tradition, but it needs to be recognized that the gradual move toward “concise exemplum”—such as Wansbrough postulates—can also be traced among hadith collections themselves and probably more fruitfully so.

The hadith materials studied in this essay constitute a specimen of what may, for want of a better characterization, be designated “traditionist historiography.” Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, al-Tabari, and others who are commonly recognized as “historians” were traditionists (*muḥaddithūn*), too, and their works exhibit certain features of a traditionist methodology—most conspicuously, the use (with varying degrees of rigor) of the *isnād*. There are indications, however, that, in the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries A.H., a practical if imprecise distinction had come to be made between the *muḥaddithūn* and the *akhbārīyyūn*,⁶⁴ and although one might write in the tradition of both, a particular work (or perhaps one’s oeuvre) would probably be considered to be either hadith or something else. ʿAbd al-Razzaq, Ibn Abi Shayba, and al-Bukhari were, more than anything else, traditionists, and their *maghāzī* are but a component of their corpus of hadith; the same can scarcely be said of the “historical” writings of Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, al-Tabari, and others. This being so, the former’s *maghāzī* may be seen as the kind of “history” a traditionist qua traditionist sought to preserve and transmit. The traditionists’ choices about what was to form part of their collections of *maghāzī*, insofar as there were such collections, are in fact sufficient reason to distinguish them—and their methods and concerns—from

the historians'. Even a relatively fuller treatment such as that of Ibn Abi Shayba is very different, after all, from what Ibn Ishaq or al-Waqidi aspired to do. Traditionist historiography is therefore significant not so much as a supplement to what is otherwise known—although it can sometimes function as such a supplement⁶⁵—as for what it tells us about the traditionists themselves, about how they viewed early Islamic history, and what they deemed worth remembering in it.⁶⁶

Among traditionists of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.H., there are many to whom writings on the *maghāzī* are attributed.⁶⁷ Most of these seem no longer to be extant, so it is impossible to ascertain their precise contents. If “traditionist historiography” as postulated here is indeed a distinct genre, it may not be far-fetched to speculate that the writings of these prominent traditionists also belonged to it and that they reflected—much as Ibn Abi Shayba's *Maghāzī* do—the traditionists' choices and decisions about how to view the history of early Islam.

The three hadith texts studied here are important as specimens of traditionist historiography, but they are also significant for some clues they may, on further inquiry, give about a certain shift, a transition—in fact, a diminution—in the traditionists' historical interests. The *Maghāzī* of Ibn Abi Shayba still reflect a definite interest in matters historical; those of al-Bukhari do not, as we have shown at some length. It is certainly possible that the differences in material chosen by these two compilers are due simply to their individual preferences, but it is also possible that these differences reflect something more than individual peculiarities. The traditionists are known, after all, to have had reservations about the value, even legitimacy, of historical studies.⁶⁸ It is tempting to think of al-Bukhari's ahistorical *Maghāzī* as symptomatic of this disdain (although works of some historical interest were occasionally produced in traditionist circles of a later date) and of the consequent decision to divest normative sunna of many of its historical trappings. Ibn Abi Shayba's *Maghāzī* would, from this view, be interpretable as an example of what traditionist historiography may have looked like before it was overtaken by concerns similar to al-Bukhari's.

NOTES

Author's note: I thank Professor Donald P. Little for his valuable comments on an earlier draft.

¹For example, J. M. B. Jones, “The Chronology of the Maghāzī—A Textual Survey,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 19 (1957): 245–80; idem, “Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidi: The Dream of ʿĀtika and the Raid to Nakhla in Relation to the Charge of Plagiarism,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 22 (1959): 41–51; J. Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978); W. M. Watt, “The Reliability of Ibn Ishāq's Sources,” *La vie du prophète Mahomet*, Colloque de Strasbourg, October 1980 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1983), 31–43 (esp. 33 f., 39, and 41, on al-Bukhari); E. Landau-Tasseron, “Processes of Redaction: The Case of the Tamīmīte Delegation to the Prophet Muḥammad,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 49 (1986): 253–70.

²C. H. Becker, “Grundsätzlichen zur Leben-Muhammadforschung,” in *Islamstudien* (Leipzig: Verlag Quelle und Meyer, 1924), 1:521 f.; J. Schacht, “A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1949): 150 f.; J. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 183; idem, *Sectarian Milieu*, 85.

³Wansbrough, *Sectarian Milieu*, 77 f.

⁴For a critique of the lack or insufficiency of such realization in the scholarship on medieval Islamic legal theory, for instance, see Wael B. Hallaq, *Law and Legal Theory in Classical and Medieval Islam* (London: Variorum, 1995).

⁵Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām al-Šanʿānī, *Kitāb al-Muṣannaf*, 11 vols., ed. H. R. al-Aʿzamī (Beirut: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī, 1972); *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*: *ibid.*, 5:313–492. On ʿAbd al-Razzāq and his *Muṣannaf*, see F. Sezgin, *Geschichte der arabischen Schrifttums* (hereafter GAS), 9 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 1:99; H. Motzki, “The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Šanʿānī as a Source of Authentic *Aḥādīth* of the First Century A.H.,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 50 (1991): 1–21; *idem*, *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz: ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991), esp. 50–67.

⁶Ibn Abī Shayba, *Kitāb al-Muṣannaf*, ed. K. Y. al-Ḥūt (Beirut: Dār al-Tāj, 1989); *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*: *ibid.*, 7:326–445. On Ibn Abī Shayba, see GAS, 1:108 f.

⁷Al-Bukhārī, *al-Jāmiʿ al-Šaḥīḥ*, ed. L. Krehl (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1862–1908); *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*: *ibid.*, 3:52–193. On al-Bukhārī, see GAS, 1:115–34. Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent references to ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Ibn Abī Shayba, and al-Bukhari will be to their respective *maghāzī*.

⁸Motzki, *Die Anfänge*, 55. On Maʿmar ibn Rashid, see *ibid.*, index, s.v.; Sezgin, GAS, 1:290 f.

⁹Motzki notes that ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, as well as his *Kitāb al-Jāmiʿ*, which is likewise indebted to Maʿmar, both have traditions other than Maʿmar’s. “Deshalb ist es denkbar, daß schon ʿABDARRAZZĀQ oder seine Schüler sie als Teil seines [namely, ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s] Traditionswerkes betrachteten”; Motzki, *Die Anfänge*, 55 f. On the subsequent transmission of ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf*, see Ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī (d. 1179), *Fahrasa mā rawāḥ ʿan shuyūkhīhi . . . Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Khayr . . . al-Ishbīlī*, ed. F. Codera and J. R. Tarrago (Baghdad: Maktabat al-Muthannā, 1963 [reprint of the 1894–95 edition]), 127–31.

¹⁰H. Schützinger, “Ibn Abī Šaiba und sein Taʾrīx: Eine Untersuchung an Hand des MS. Berlin 9409,” *Oriens* 23–24 (1974): 134–46. (I have not been able to examine ms. Berlin 9409 myself and therefore rely on Schützinger’s description of its contents.)

¹¹Schützinger, who did not consult any complete text of the *Muṣannaf*, thinks that the manuscript of Ibn Abī Shayba’s *Taʾrīkh*, which he has described is not a part of the *Muṣannaf*. His arguments to that effect, however, are not compelling (see “Ibn Abī Šaiba,” 145: “Hier erhebt sich . . . die Frage, ob es denkbar ist, dass ein 109 1/2 Blatt umfassendes, chronologisch geordnetes und in Kapitel eingeteiltes Geschichtswerk Bestandteil eines *Muṣannaf*-Buches sein kann. Es ist kaum vorstellbar, dass sich ein solches Werk in das den *Muṣannaf*-Büchern eigene Schema einpasst”), and his description of the contents of ms. Berlin 9409 reveals a very marked resemblance to the text of the *Kitāb al-Maghāzī* in the *Muṣannaf*. Note that Aloys Sprenger, who was probably acquainted with the complete text of the *Muṣannaf* and who used the *Taʾrīkh* for his *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad* (Berlin, 1869), had little doubt that the *Taʾrīkh* did form “part of the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Aby Shaybah” (see Schützinger, “Ibn Abī Šaiba,” 140 f., quoting Sprenger’s handwritten note on the manuscript of the *Taʾrīkh*, and cf. *ibid.*, 145). On the history of the transmission of Ibn Abī Shayba’s *Muṣannaf*, see Ibn Khayr, *Fahrasa*, 131–33.

¹²Ibn Abī Shayba, “*Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh*,” in *Muṣannaf*, 6:546–64; cf. Schützinger, “Ibn Abī Šaiba,” 145.

¹³E. Landau-Tasseron, “Sayf Ibn ʿUmar in Medieval and Modern Scholarship,” *Der Islam*, 67 (1990): 6 ff. and esp. 9 warns of the dangers of such a distinction but defends it nevertheless. Nabia Abbott, too, makes a sharp distinction between “hadith” and “*khbar*”—on the basis of their respective contents and the methods of their transmission, see Abbott’s *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri*, II: *Qurʾānic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 29, 77, 91, 118, 145, 233, 244, 256.

¹⁴For the conventional chronology of the *maghāzī*, see Jones, “Chronology,” 245–80.

¹⁵For the position of this *ghazwa* in the overall chronology of the *maghāzī*, see Jones, “Chronology,” 247, 259.

¹⁶See M. Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra’ in Early Islamic Scholarship,” in *La vie du prophète Mahomet*, 65 f., who makes the same point with reference to the *Maghāzī* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq.

¹⁷But see G. R. Hawting, “al-Ḥudaybiyya and the Conquest of Mecca: A Reconsideration of the Tradition about the Muslim Takeover of the Sanctuary,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 8 (1986): 16, who seems to make much of ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s chronologically awkward juxtaposition of his materials. That there is an implicit “causal sequence” in the way these materials are presented is, however, a gratuitous assumption.

¹⁸See Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra,’” 65 f.

¹⁹Norman Calder, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 179.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 195.

²¹The expressions “notebooks,” “finished works,” “real books,” and so forth, are Calder’s: *Studies*, 179, 180, and 171–81, *passim*. Cf. B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1964), 157 ff., on “written notes” and “notebooks” used (illegitimately) in Rabbinic Judaism to study, learn, and better remember the growing materials of the oral Torah. Although his hypotheses concerning “notebooks” and other “literary forms” characteristic of the intellectual milieu in early Islam seem indebted, *inter alia*, to Gerhardsson’s work, Calder claims much more for early Islam than Gerhardsson does for Rabbinic Judaism, and it remains unclear, in any case, how much of early Islamic literary practice can be extrapolated from Rabbinic evidence.

²²Calder, *Studies*, 194.

²³Al-Bukhārī, *Maghāzī*, 53 f.

²⁴On the *diwān*: cf. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition (*Et*²), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960–); s.v. “*Dīwān*” (A. A. al-Duri et al.).

²⁵Al-Bukhārī, *Maghāzī*, 71.

²⁶See notes 50 ff., below.

²⁷See L. O. Mink, “Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument,” in *Historical Understanding*, ed. B. Fay et al. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 197: “A narrative must have a unity of its own; this is what is acknowledged in saying that it must have a beginning, middle, and an end.” Also see *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*, ed. R. Fowler (London: Routledge, 1987), s.v. “Narrative,” “Narrative Structure.”

²⁸F. R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian’s Language* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1983), 204 and *passim*.

²⁹As a *narratio*, however peculiar in form and content, it presupposes other *narrations*: Ibn Abi Shayba’s account of Badr has some interesting parallels and contrasts with al-Waqidi’s, for instance, which deserve to be explored, although the task cannot be undertaken in the present context.

³⁰See the familiar example of the omission, in Ibn Hisham’s recension of Ibn Ishaq’s account, of the tradition about the capture of al-ʿAbbas at Badr and of the Prophet’s demand that he ransom himself; al-Tabari does have a report to this effect, via Ibn Ishaq, which suggests that the report in question was a part of Ibn Ishaq’s original text of the *Sira*. See A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of [Ibn] Ishaq’s Sirat Rasūl Allāh* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), 312 f. Note too that al-ʿAbbas does not figure in the list of prisoners at Badr, although 43 men are supposed to have been captured and only 42 are named: Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, 338 f. and n. 1 on 338; see also R. Sellheim, “Prophet, Chalif und Geschichte: Die Muhammed-Biographie des Ibn Ishāq,” *Oriens*, 18–19 (1965–66): 49. For another example of the suppression, or rather the editing, of a tradition unfavorable to al-ʿAbbas, see M. J. Kister and M. Plessner, “Notes on Caskel’s ʿĠamharat an-Nasab,” *Oriens*, 25–26 (1976): 64 f. What Funkenstein says of ancient and medieval—Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian—historians would seem to hold for Muslim writers, as well: “it had to occur to some ancient and medieval authors—as indeed it did—that the historian, rather than being a mere spectator, possesses a *ius vitae nocendi* of sorts over that which he should record. He or she can make and unmake history, can obliterate names, events, identities by not recording them, for evil or good purposes. Activity and memory belong together: without memory, the political activity cannot affect future generations”: A. Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 30.

³¹Al-Bukhārī, *Maghāzī*, 68 f.

³²ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Maghāzī*, 353 (no. 9729).

³³Ibn Abi Shayba, *Maghāzī*, 357 (no. 36679).

³⁴*Ibid.*, 363 (no. 36717).

³⁵*Ibid.*, 361 (no. 36700).

³⁶*Ibid.* (no. 36702).

³⁷See al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrikh Baghdād*, 14 vols. (Cairo, 1931), 10:66–71 (no. 5185), esp. 67 f.

³⁸L. O. Mink’s view of historical narrative as a “configurational” mode of comprehension, where “the actions and events of a story comprehended as a whole are *connected by a network of overlapping descriptions*,” can probably be applied to a work such as Ibn Abi Shayba’s, as well (see Mink, “History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension,” in *Historical Understanding*, 42–60; the quotation is from p. 58). The “overlap of descriptions,” Mink notes, “may not be part of the story itself (as one thing after another) but only of the comprehension of it as a whole” (*ibid.*). In Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Maghāzī*, but also in chronicles such as al-Tabari’s, the overlap—of traditions and descriptions—is a part of the story,

however; it is precisely such overlapping traditions that construct and comprise the “image” of the past that emerges from their configuration. (On the centrality of constructing such an “image” [or “narrative substance”] to the function of a *narratio*, see Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic*, chap. 5 and passim.)

³⁹It was, in any case, on the wrong side that al-ʿAbbas had taken part in the battle.

⁴⁰For al-Bukhari’s traditions on Hudaybiyya, see his *Maghāzī*, 110–19. The outline given here takes note of the major themes but does not encompass all the traditions that make up al-Bukhari’s material on Hudaybiyya.

⁴¹Ibn Abī Shayba, *Maghāzī*, 381–90.

⁴²ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Maghāzī*, 330–43.

⁴³On “common links,” see J. Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammad Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 171 f.

⁴⁴To the coherent narrative account of Hudaybiyya in ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s recension are appended two further traditions, both of which attest that it was ʿAli ibn Abi Talib who wrote the document (*kitāb*) of the agreement at Hudaybiyya. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Maghāzī*, 342 f. (nos. 9721 f.).

⁴⁵Wansbrough, *Sectarian Milieu*, 87 (emphasis added); also cited in Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra,’” 63.

⁴⁶See al-Bukhārī, *Maghāzī*, 187 f., 190.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 185.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 191.

⁴⁹See Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra,’” 65 f. ʿAli figures very prominently in many of ʿAbd al-Razzaq’s traditions, but these do not necessarily have a pro-ʿAli, much less a Shiʿi, character. ʿAbd al-Razzaq is nevertheless supposed to have been a Shiʿi.

⁵⁰Pseudo-al-Nāshīʾ al-Akbar, “*Masāʾil al-Imāma*,” in *Frühe muʿtazilitische Häresiographie*, ed. J. van Ess (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1971), 66 (ad the *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth* of Baghdad). More generally, see W. Madelung, *Der Imām al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen* (Berlin, 1965), 225 ff.

⁵¹Van Ess, *Häresiographie*, 65 f.

⁵²See, for instance, al-Khallāl, *al-Musnad min Masāʾil Abī ʿAbdallāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal*, British Library Ms. Or. 2675, fol. 63a, and fols. 56a ff.; more generally, see Madelung, *Der Imām al-Qāsim*, 225 ff., and T. Nagel, “Das Problem der Orthodoxie im frühen Islam,” in *Studien zum Minderheitenproblem im Islam* (Bonn, 1973), 1:7–44.

⁵³Ibn Abī Shayba, *Maghāzī*, 440 (no. 37075).

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 440 f. (no. 37078), 442 (no. 37090).

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 441 (no. 37079).

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 441 (no. 37079), 442 (nos. 37087 f.).

⁵⁷On the murder of ʿUthman, see al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrikh al-Rusul waʿl-Mulūk*, 16 vols., ed. M. J. de Goeje et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1879–1901), I:2980–3025; and R. S. Humphreys, “Qurʾanic Myth and Narrative Structure in Early Islamic Historiography,” in *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity*, ed. F. M. Clover and R. S. Humphreys (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 279 ff., for a perceptive analysis of al-Ṭabarī’s accounts.

⁵⁸Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaf*, 7:532–64. Note that Ibn Abi Shayba is said to have compiled, inter alia, both a *Kitāb al-Jamal* and a *Kitāb Ṣifīn*: Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel (Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1870–71), 229. If the contents of these two works are identical with those of the aforementioned sections of the *Muṣannaf*, the subsumption—in the latter—of traditions relating to Sifīn as a subsection of the *Kitāb al-Jamal* would seem to be the work of some later redactor or editor.

⁵⁹Cf. *Kitāb al-Jamal*, 535 (no. 37768), 542 (no. 37807), and 547 (no. 37841 ff.). Needless to say, the point these traditions make is also important for the juristic precedent it establishes (namely, how to treat opponents or rebels when they are Muslims).

⁶⁰ʿAṣīsha: *ibid.*, 536 (no. 37771 f.), 542 (no. 37811); ʿAli: 536 (no. 37774), 539 (no. 37795 f.), 541 (no. 37802), 543 (no. 37812), 545 (no. 37832), 548 (no. 37852); Talha: 545 (no. 37827); al-Zubayr, 545 (no. 37828).

⁶¹*Kitāb al-Jamal*, passim, and esp. 540 f. (no. 37798), 544 (no. 37817), 551 (no. 37871). On the “betrayal” motif in early Islamic historiography, see Humphreys, “Qurʾanic Myth and Narrative Structure,” 278 ff.

⁶²Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra,’” 63.

⁶³In his article on “Maghāzī” in EI2, Hinds only summarizes his earlier findings as set out in “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra.’”

⁶⁴See Landau-Tasseron, “Sayf Ibn ‘Umar,” 9: “the fact is that certain scholars may be classified either as *muḥaddithūn* or as *akhbāriyyūn*, whereas others may not, which means that the differentiation is not baseless. That the classification of some of the early historians is not clear-cut does not turn the two fields into one. Nor does it alter the impression that, in general, the attitude of the early unmistakable *muḥaddithūn* towards the historians was one of suspicion and distrust.” Also see S. Leder, “The Literary Use of the *Khabar*: A Basic Form of Historical Writing,” in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, ed. A. Cameron and L. I. Conrad (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1992), 313 ff.

⁶⁵See M. Lecker, “The Ḥudaybiyya-Treaty and the Expedition against Khaybar,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 5 (1984): 6 ff., *ad* Ibn Abi Shayba, *Ta’rikh*, Ms. Berlin 9409, fol. 57a. For a parallel passage (with minor variants, which, in all probability, are copyists’ mistakes) in Ibn Abi Shayba’s *Maghāzī*, see *Maghāzī*, 382 (no. 36839).

⁶⁶Another specimen of “traditionist historiography” may perhaps be seen in the so-called *ṣaḥīfa* of the Egyptian traditionist and judge Ibn Lahī‘a. He has traditions here about, inter alia, the murder of ‘Uthman and the revolt of ‘Abdallāh ibn Zubayr. On the *ṣaḥīfa* and its author, see R. G. Khoury, *‘Abd Allāh ibn Lahī‘a (97–174/715–790): Juge et grand maître de l’école égyptienne* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986). Khoury argues (p. 181) that Ibn Lahī‘a was at once a *muḥaddith* and a historian, which may have been the case. His traditions however are hadith in an apocalyptic idiom more than they are anything else, and they are of interest primarily for showing how aspects of the first and the second *fitna* may have been remembered by, and recounted in, certain traditionist circles in Egypt.

⁶⁷See Hinds, “‘Maghāzī’ and ‘Sīra,’” 60 f. for a list of scholars—all of whom died in the second half of the second century A.H.—who are said to have written on the *maghāzī*.

⁶⁸Al-Sakhāwī’s (d. 1497) *al-I‘lān bi’l-tawbikh li-man dhamma ahl al-tawrikh* (Damascus, 1349 A.H.; trans. by F. Rosenthal in idem, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 2nd ed. [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968], 269–529; the following references are to this translation) is not only an elaborate defense of the legitimacy and usefulness of historical studies, it also gives a broad sampling of the kinds of criticism traditionist scholars had for history (see, especially, Rosenthal, *Historiography*, 338 ff.). Despite the late date of this treatise, many of the traditionist criticisms it quotes, and seeks to refute, purport to go back to the first centuries of Islam. It is noteworthy that, besides criticisms directed at historical studies per se, many a traditionist seems to have been critical even of the *jarḥ wa ta‘dīl* genre, a traditionist stronghold, for it was thought to involve slandering the reputation of scholars. (Whether *jarḥ wa ta‘dīl* was “history” at all is a question neither al-Sakhawī nor the critics he is engaged with seem to ask.) Note, too, that al-Sakhawī himself, in outlining a “legal classification” of history, recognizes that certain aspects of it do fall into the category of the “forbidden”: “This applies, especially, to stories told in connection with the biographies (*siyar*) of the prophets. Then, there is the information about disputes among the men around Muhammad (which is also forbidden), because the historical informants (*akhbāri*) who report it as a rule exaggerate and mix things up” (Rosenthal, *Historiography*, 335).