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 hadith transmitters. These three texts are hadiths 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, hadith 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 hadiths, 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 hadiths 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 ʿala 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 hadiths 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.

3 Outside the Islamic tradition, one or more of the three is mentioned in Leone Caetani, Annali del'Islām (Milan: Ulrico Hoepli, 1918), 8:380f.; Majid Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1955), 84; Yohanan Friedmann, “The Attitude of the JamʿiyyatiʿUlama-IHind 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, 2003), 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, 1989), 265 f.

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-Abhath 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 Muhammad 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 *īsnāds* 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 Ḥanafi jurist al-Ṭaḥāwī presents versions of all three *ḥadīths*, as follows:6

1. The well armed squadron of Jews
   ‘Ubayd b. Rijāl – Hadiya b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb – al-Fadl b. Mūsā al-Sīnānī – Muḥammad b. ‘Amr – Sa‘d b. Mundhir al-Sā‘īdī – Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā‘īdī, who said: ‘The Prophet went out on the day of Uhud, continuing until he had passed Thanīyat al-Wadā‘. 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-Ṭaḥāwī, *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-Samḥūdī holds for north: al-Samḥūdī, *Wafā‘ al-Wafā‘ bi-akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. Q. al-Sāmarrā‘î (London: Mu’assasat al-Furqān li-l-Turāth al-Islāmī, 2001), 4195–201.
Qaynuqā‘, the tribe (raḥt) of ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām,8 and the people (qawm) of ʿAbd 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 ʿAbd Allāh – ʿAbd 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-Wabara,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, “ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām,” in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573‑3912.islam_SIM_0963.

9 A major figure in Muhammad’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, “ʿAbd 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, Wafāʾ, 4:236f., where a version is quoted; Otto Loth, “Die Vulkanregionen (Ḥarra’s) von Arabien nach Jākût,” 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, “Dhīrā,” in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573‑3912.islam_SIM_1825), or 52/3 Arab miles less 100 cubits by al-Samhūdī’s calculation, or 9.2 km. by modern satellite measurements). Here those making ḥajj from Medina entered ihram (i.e., it is the mīqāt of Medina). In one version the location is given as Dhū l-Ḥulayfa itself (al-Samhūdī, Wafāʾ, 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-Bayḍā’. He said to him, as he had the first time, “Do you believe in God and his Apostle?” He replied, “Yes.” Then the Propet said, “Then come along (fa-nṭaliq).”

3. The rejection of Khubayb

Hūṣayn b. Naṣr – Yazīd b. Hārūn – Mustalim b. Saʿīd – Khubayb b. ‘Ābd 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. 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. Such coopera-

---

13 An elevation immediately above Dhū l-Ḥulayfah to the west (al-Samhūdi, Wafāʾ, 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: Muhammad's First Legal Document (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2004).
15 In the juristic literature the classic case is the Meccan Ṣafwān b. Umayya (d. ca. 41/661), who took part in the Battle of Ḥunayn on the Muslims’ side before his conversion and with Muhammad’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 mawālī or “client” of an Arab tribe, the primary avenue to inclusion in the early Islamic community. The three hadiths 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 hadiths 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 hadiths 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. 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 hadiths 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 hadith 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’ān implies by the phrase al-ḥukm li-llāh (“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 hadith 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 hadith.

16 On non-Muslim mawālī, see, e.g., Sobhi Bouderbala, “Les mawālī à Fustat 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 hadith critics, and is thus somewhat exogenous to their discourse. For hadith 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 travelling 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-Wadā’, 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. 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-Baydā’, 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. 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): 85–101. 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-Muʿtaṣim’s Baghdad or al-Mustanṣir’s Cairo might testify. Partly for this reason, the early Muslims established the ʿaṃṣār – 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 (Uḥød). 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 hadīths 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 hadīth 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 (haddathanā, akhbaranā, ‘an, 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 hadīth is to be found. The name belongs to the compiler to whom the work is attributed.

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

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 hadīth 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 = Isfarā’īn; Iṣ = Iṣbahān; Ğğ = Jurjān; Md = Medina; Mn = al-Madā’īn; Mv = Marw; Nā = Nasā; Ns = Naysābūr; R = Rayy; Sq = Samarqand; W = Wāsīt

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**

|          | Uḥud | 600 Jews | ‘Abdallāh b. Salām mentioned | Ibn Ubayy on site | B. Qaynuqā’ mentioned | The Prophet and conversion | Dictum |
|----------|------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------|
|          |      |          |                               |                   |                        |                            |        |
| Bayhaqi  |      | ×        |                               |                   | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
| al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī |      | ×        |                               |                   | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
| Hišām b. ‘Ammār | ×    | ×        |                               |                   |                        | ×                          | ×       |
| Ibn Abī Shayba |      | ×        |                               |                   |                        | ×                          | ×       |
| Ibn Sa’d |      | ×        | ×                              | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          |        |
| Ṭabarānī |      | ×        | ×                              | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          |        |
| Ḥāzimī |      | ×        | ×                              | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
| Ibn al-Mundhir | ×    | ×        |                               | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
| Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim | ×    | ×        |                               | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
| Ṭaḥāwī |      | ×        | ×                              | ×                  | ×                      | ×                          | ×       |
FIGURE 2.2 The mushrik of Badr


| Table 2.2 The mushrik of Badr |
|--------------------------------|
| | Ḥarrat al-Wabra | al-Shajara | al-Bayḍāʾ | Speech upon volunteering | Order to return | 1st – prsn. | astaʾīn | nastaʾīn | Closing line |
| Maʾn | | | | li-attabiʾaka wa-uṣība ... | × | × (lan) | fa-nṭaliq |
| Tirmidhi | × | | | | | | |
| Ibn Wahb | Saḥnūn | | | li-attabiʾaka wa-uṣīra ... | × | × (lan) | fa-nṭaliq |
| Ibn al-Mundhir | | | | li-attabiʾaka wa-uṣība ... | × | × (lan) | fa-nṭaliq |
| al-Bayhaqi | | | | li-attabiʾaka wa-uṣība ... | × | × (lan) | fa-nṭaliq |
| AbūʿAwāna | | | | li-attabiʾaka wa-uṣība ... | × | × (lan) | fa-nṭaliq |
| AbūʿAwāna | | | | | | no matn given |

21 Tirmidhi notes that “there is more to the hadīth than this”, making his version a poor candidate for matn comparison.
|             | Ha'arrat al-Wabra | al-Shajara | al-Bayda' | Speech upon volunteering | Order to return | 1st – prsn. | asta'in | nasta'in | Closing line |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|------------|---------|----------|--------------|
| Ta'ahawi    | ×                  | ×          | ×         | li-attabi'aka wa-usiba ... | ×              | ×          | × (lan) |          | fa-n탈iq    |
| Muslim      | ×                  | ×          | ×         | li-attabi'aka wa-usiba ... | ×              | ×          | × (lan) |          | fa-n탈iq    |
| Bishr       | Ibn Jarud          | Badr only toponym mentioned | akhruju ma'aka? |                          | ×              |            | × (lā) |          | (no conversion) |
|             | Abū ʿAwāna         |            |           |                           |                |            |         |          | no matn given |
| Ta'ahawi    | Badr only toponym mentioned | akhruju ma'aka? |       |                           | ×              |            | × (lā) |          | (no conversion) |
| Ibn Saʿīd   | Abū Dāʾūd          | No toponym mentioned |            |                           | ×              |            | × (lā) |          | (no conversion) |
|             | Dāraquṭnī²²         | No toponym mentioned | akīna ... wa-usiba ... |                          | ×              |            | × (lā) |          | wa-n탈alaqa ma'ahu |

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-Baydā’ Speech upon volunteering | Order to return | 1st – prsn. | astaʾin | nestaʾin | Closing line |
| Nasāʾī | No toponym mentioned | li-akūna ... wa-üşiba ... | | | × (lā) | | | fa-nṭalaqa maʾahu |
| Ibn Mahdi | Nasāʾī | dictum only | | | × (lan) | | | (no conversion) |
| Ibn Ḥanbal | × | × | × li-attabiʾaka wa-üşiba ... | × | | × (lan) | fa-kharaja bihi |
| Taḥāwī | No toponym mentioned | | | | | × (lā) | | (no conversion) |
| Muslim | | | | | no matn given | | | |
| Ibn Ḥibbān | No toponym mentioned | | | | | × (lā) | | (no conversion) |
| Wakiʿ | Dārimī | dictum only | | | | × (lā) | | (no conversion) |
| Nasāʾī | dictum only | | | | | (no conversion) |
| Ibn Ṣahwāyḥ | dictum only | | | | | (no conversion) |
| Ibn Ḥanbal | dictum only (ʿAbdallāh supplies, without isnād, the above version from Ibn Ḥanbal to supplement) | | | | | × (lā) | | (no conversion) |
|        | Ḥarrat al-Wabra | al-Shajara | al-Baydā’ | Speech upon volunteering | Order to return | 1st – prsn. | asta‘īn | nasta‘īn | Closing line |
|--------|----------------|------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------|------------|---------|----------|--------------|
| Ibn Abī Shayba |                |            |          | dictum only             | ×              |            | (lā)    | (lā)     | (no conversion) |
| Ibn Māja    |                |            |          | dictum only             | ×              |            | (lā)    | (lā)     | (no conversion) |
| Unique      |                |            |          |                         | ×              |            | (lā)    | (lā)     | fa-nṭaliq    |
| Nasā‘ī      | ×              | ×          | ×        | li-attabi‘aka wa-uṣība  | ×              | ×          | (lān)   |          | fa-nṭaliq    |
| Jahṣamī     | ×              | ×          | ×        | li-ubāyi‘aka wa-uṣība   | ×              | ×          | (lān)   |          | fa-nṭaliq    |
| Ibn Ḥanbal  | No toponym mentioned |         |          | attabi‘aka li-uṣība     |                |            |         |          | fa-nṭalaqa fa-tabī‘ahu |
| Dārimī      |                |            |          |                         |                |            |         |          | no matn given, described only as longer than the other Dārimī version |
| Ṭahāwi     | ×              | × (Dhu l-Ḥulayfa) | ×        | akhrju mu’aka fi-uqāṭīlu wa-uṣība | ×              |          | (lān)   |          | fa-na’am idhan |
| Ibn ‘Adī    |                |            |          |                         |                |            |         |          | lā tasta‘īnū |
"I'll not accept aid from a mushrik"
Table 2.3 The rejection of Khubayb

| Prior Islam denied | Objective | Dictum | Conversion | Battle deeds, domestic aftermath |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------------------------|
|                    |           | simple | “against mushrikūn” |                    |
| al-Ṭabarānī        | ×         |        | ×          | ×                               |
| Abū Nuʿaym         | ×         |        | ×          | ×                               |
| al-Ṭabarānī        |           |        | ×          |                                 |
| al-Ṭabarānī (2 isnāds) | wajh   | ×      | ×          | ×                               |
| Ibn Abī Shyba      | wajh      |        | ×          | ×                               |
| al-Bukhārī         | wajh      |        | ×          | ×                               |
| Ibn Abī Khaythama  |           |        | ×          |                                 |
| Ibn Saʿd           | ×         | ghazw  | ×          | ×                               |
| al-Ḥākim           | ×         | baʿd ghazawātīh | ×      | ×                               |
| al-Bayhaqī         | ×         | baʿd ghazawātīh | ×      | ×                               |
| Baḥshal            | ×         | baʿd maghāzīh | ×      | ×                               |
| Abū Nuʿaym (2 isnāds) | ghazw | ×      | ×          | ×                               |
| Ibn Ḥanbal         | ×         | ghazw  | ×          | ×                               |
| al-Rūyānī          | ×         | baʿd ghazawātīh | ×      | ×                               |
| al-Khaṭīb          | ×         | ghazw  | ×          | ×                               |
| al-Ṭaḥāwī          | ×         | ghazw  | ×          |                                 |
| al-Ṭaḥāwī          |           | no matn given |          |                                 |
The “Travelling Tradition Test” (TT Test), recently formulated by Behnam Sadeghi, is a useful tool for dating *ḥadīth* 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.\(^\text{23}\)

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 *ḥadīth*s? 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 *ṭayyib* sbypassing the later potential “common link” (al-Faḍīl b. Mūsā) as Juynbollian “dives,” a choice that I will argue on textual grounds to be unwise,\(^\text{24}\) Marw.\(^\text{25}\) For the
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 hadīths. The isnāds thus give these hadīths the appearance of regionalism (“geographic clustering of contents”). But why should we believe that isnāds carry historical information about the actual paths, human and thus geographical, along which the hadīths 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 hadīth 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.

These formulations apply to the present case, and point to a Medinan origin for all three hadīths. They arise from a single insight about hadīths: 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 hadīths 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 hadīths to early Medinan transmitters.

b.ʿAmr, 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,” 205f.
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 hadith 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 hadiths, 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 hadiths 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 isnâds in another way, using not only principles that apply to any cluster of textually related hadiths, but also the data for these particular hadiths. A further reason for such an independent test is that we have only three related hadiths 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.”

The dictum in combination with its associated narrative sequence is distinctive to these three hadiths.

We possess an independent test of the isnâds’ integrity in matn-cum-isnâd analysis: comparison of the contents of the different versions of a certain hadith, with attention to the putative routes of transmission found in their isnâds. Matn-cum-isnâd analyses of the three hadiths that contain variations on the dictum “I will not accept aid from a mushrik” strongly suggest that their isnâds 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 isnâds’ historical validity is strong because in numerous cases, versions whose isnâds 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 hadith about the mushrik of Badr whose isnâds claim that they were transmitted from Mâlik, the “common link,” by Wakî b. al-Jarrâḥ (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 Bâṣrân authorities differed.

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 *hadiths*. 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-Ḥaḍl b. Mūsā by Khālid b. Khidāsh, and a third version that, although it does not claim to have been transmitted by Khālid, was allegedly transmitted by al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971), who also transmitted a version from Khālid. 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-Ḥaḍl 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 *hadith*, 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 *hadiths* 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-
sition 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 Muṣannaf. 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 hadīth 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 Mahdī, 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. Hārin, but narrated the hadīth 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 hadīth, Ibn Mahdī, might have heard the hadīth 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 hadīth about the mushrik of Badr at different times, and Ibn Mahdī and Ibn Wahb might have heard the same version from him on the same occasion, while Waki’ (for example) might have heard from Mālik only the dictum. Then, Ibn Mahdī, 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 hadīths. This fact erodes but does not efface the strong impression made by the matn-cum-isnād analyses: that the isnāds of these hadīths 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 hadīths, 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.\textsuperscript{30} Specifically, two of the \textit{hadīths} 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 \textit{hadīth} was usually responsible for bringing it into circulation and attaching to it a fictitious \textit{isnād}.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{hadīths} 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 \textit{hadīths} 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 \textit{hadīth} about the squadron of Jews allegedly moved diffusely from Medina to Kūfa, Damascus, and Marw, that about the \textit{mushrīk} 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 \textit{hadīths} 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

\textsuperscript{30} For Motzki, the common links observed in the \textit{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).

\textsuperscript{31} For a synopsis of Schacht’s position, see Motzki, “Dating,” 219f. Similar assumptions animated the scholarship of Gauthier H.A. Juynboll (see, e.g., \textit{Encyclopedia}, xxviii, col. 1). For a succinct critique of Juynboll’s method, see the review by Jonathan Brown (\textit{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 ḥadīth, 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 ḥadīth, and if these three ḥadīth 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 Ḥimṣ) 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 Qurʾānic 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 *iṣnāds* 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-Zuhri (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 ʿUbāda b. al-Šāmīt (d. ca. 34/654 or 55) would not accept the aid of 500 Jewish fighters. It occurs with a unique *iṣnād*, and was not widely known among jurists. It was purportedly included in *tafsīr* material attributed to Ibn ʿAbbas (d. 68/687 or 688) by al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāḥim (d. ca. 105/723), according to to Juwaybara b. Saʿīd al-Azdi (d. ca. 145/762). Al-Ḍaḥḥāk is said to have heard Ibn ʿAbbas’ *tafsīr* material from the Kūfīan Saʿīd 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-Samarqandi, *Tafsīr al-Samarqandi*, ed. ‘A. Mu‘awwaḍ et al. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1993), 1:34. For the ʿUbāda tradition, see Schöller, *Exegetisches Denken*, 234, and to his citations add al-Tha‘labī, *al-Kashf wa-l-bayān*, ed. Abū Muhammad b. ʿAshūr (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 2002), 3:47. On al-Ḍaḥḥāk, see A. Paket-Chy and C. Gilliot, “Works on hadith 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), 498, 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 *iṣnāds*, in other sources, notable the *Sharḥ Kitāb al-siyar* of al-Sarakhsī (attrib. to al-Shaybānī) and the *Kitāb al-magḥāzi* of al-Waqqāṣi. These are readily explicable within the model of transmission here proposed; al-Waqqāṣi 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. ʿUbayd and, possibly, Saʿīd h. Yahyā, a Kūfīan 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, *Mughni*, 13:97 ff., and Ibn Ḥazm, *Muhallā*, 7:334–335.
4 Toward Using the *ḥadīth* as Historical Sources

At present it is not possible to reach conclusions about the historical accuracy of the three *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*. 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 *ḥadīth* 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 munaqati’ 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 Sa’d b. al-Mundhir; his personal name, according to some authorities, was also Sa’d b. al-Mundhir. The younger Sa’d 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. ‘Amr. There are thus indications that a primitive version of the ḥadīth narrated by Muḥammad b. ‘Amr 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. ‘Amr (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 ‘Abd Allāh b. Niyār (d. ?) transmitted from the famous ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 93/712),35 giving it an anomalous appearance; it is not corroborated by any of the numerous other accounts that ‘Urwa related about Muḥammad’s life, to transmitters with whom he had sustained interaction. ‘Abd Allāh b. Niyār is a hazy figure. His father’s name frequently comes through as Dinār, and the famously reliable Kūfan transmitter Wākī 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 ‘Abd Allāh, in the form Mālik – ‘Abd Allāh b. Yazid – Ibn Niyār (Ibn Māja, Ibn Abī Shayba, and Ibn Ḥanbal apud al-Khallāl) or Mālik – ‘Abd Allāh b. Dinār (al-Dārimī). This would not be so problematic – even Wākī can be forgiven the occasional mistake – but for the fact that Wākī 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 ‘Abd 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 hadīth containing the dictum, which, if one regards his alleged informant al-Fudayl as a spurious link in the isnād, could explain how he really heard it. He might of course really have learned it from al-Fudayl (or from an unknown transmitter), whose version might or might not have been informed by the others then circulating in Medina.

The hadīth 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 Wāsīṭī appears to have heard it in Medina, but upon its arrival in Wāsīṭ 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 Muhammad’s death, and even to contain factual elements.37 These three hadīth 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 hadīth 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 hadīth’s contents most relevant to the question of authenticity is, in fact, external: the fact that there exist multiple hadīth that convey precisely the opposite normative message. The term “precisely” is used advisedly. Muhammad 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-Huqaya: On the Origin and Reliability of Some Maghāzī Reports,” in The Biography of Muhammad: 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 hadīth 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-Shāfī‘ī (d. 204/820) on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687 or 88). Other reports, found in the Musannaf of ‘Abd 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 Muhammad’s policies, or cast off 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 Muhammad 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-Shāfī‘ī’s account of the Banū Qaynuqā’ could not serve as proof because its source was not firmly known.40 Al-Ḥāzimī (d. 584/1188) cited the oppos-

---

38 ‘Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf fī l-ḥadīth, ed. H. al-A’zamī (Beirut: al-Majlis al-‘Ilmī, 1970–), 5:188–189, no. 9328–9330; Friedmann, Tolerance, 37, no. 130; Schöller, Exegetisches Denken, 251f. Cf. Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām, Kitāb al-amwāl, ed. M. ‘Umāra (Cairo: Dār al-Shuruq, 1989), 294, no. 123; and especially the wealth of reports in Ibn Abī Shayba, al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fī l-ahādīth wa-l-āthār, ed. K.Y. al-Hūt (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 Ijtihad,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 39, no. 3 (2007): 352–354.

40 Ibn al-Mundhir, al-Awsaf, 1177. He had plainly read only the first of al-Shāfī‘ī’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-Shāfī‘ī quotes several authorities
ing view, found in al-Shāfī‘ī’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. The Imāmī al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli (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-Ḥilli 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 Qaynuqā‘.

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-Naḍīr 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. Qaynuqā‘ 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?” In al-Ṭaḥāwī’s scenario, converted...
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-Ṭaḥāwī’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. What were they doing there on the day of the battle? A learned article by Abū l-Walīd Khālid b. Fathī b. Khālid al-Aghā al-Anṣārī (b. 1386/1966 or 1967) undertakes to resolve this chronological problem. 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-Wāqidī’s account, is thus readily explained as al-Faḍl’s initiative to renovate the matn as he had done the isnād.

Ṭaḥāwī 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-Ṭaḥāwī’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, 233–255, who sees sūra 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, 251f.).

44 Entitled al-Qilāda al-ḥasnā‘ī 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 hadiths will take account of the parallels to be found in the Maghāzī of the Medinan al-Wāqidi, and in the work of his scribe, Ibn Saʿīd (see Notes to Figures 2.1 and 2.3). Al-Wāqidi knew of both the rejection of Khubayb, which he gives in a form vastly more detailed than any version of the hadīth, 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 hadīths.

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. Muʿāwiyah who marched under the banner of St. Sergius, for instance, or the two hundred Christians of Ayla who were employed by Muʿāwiya 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 hadīth that Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī narrated in Medina, describing Muḥammad’s military cooperation with Jews. On this model, the Medinan origin of these three hadīths might be explained by reference to the fact that al-Zuhrī, arguably the Marwânids’ 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 hadīths 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 hadīths 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 Muʿāwiya ʿAbbād b. ʿAbbād b. Ḥabīb al-Muhallabī al-Baṣrī, d. 181/797, mixed evaluations of reliability, significant transmitter, al-Ṭabarānī gives no isnād between ʿAbbād and himself (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl, edited by B.’A. Ma’rūf, 35 vols. (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1992), 14:128 ff., no. 3083); Abū Ḥumayd al-Sāʿidī al-Anṣārī al-Madanī, d. 60/680, grandfather of Saʿd, transmits also to ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr, said (perhaps due to this report) to have witnessed Uḥud (Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmīya, 2004), 7:350, no. 9602); Abū ʿAbd 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 Ḥudīya b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Marwazī, d. 241/855, little known, mixed reviews, explicitly linked to both al-Faḍl and Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 6:627, no. 8538); Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Fāḥishāh al-Iṣbahānī, d. 433/1041, good marks, bad theology, major transmitter from al-Ṭabarānī (al-Dhahabī, Siyar al-lām al-nubalā‘), edited by Sh. al-Arna‘ūṭ et al., 25 vols. (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1981–), 17:515 f., no. 339); Khālid b. Khīdāsh b. ‘Ajlān al-Azdi al-Baṣrī, d. 223/838, mawlā, both strong and weak marks (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 2:264 f., no. 1921); Abū Ṭāhir Abū Manṣūr Maḥmūd b. Ismā‘īl b. Muhammad al-Asghar al-Iṣbahānī, d. 514/1121, transmitter of al-Ṭabarānī’s al-Mu‘jam al-kabīr (al-Dhahabī, Siyar, 17:515 f., no. 250); Abū Ṣayf al-Mundhir b. ‘Ali b. Shu‘ayb b. Ṭāhir al-Ṣalāḥī b. ‘Amr b. al-Simsār b. Ṣalāḥ al-Manṣūrī, d. 290/903, minor transmitter, moved in Baghdad Ḥanbalī circles (Nāyif b. ‘Abū Ḥumayd al-Mardī, Irshād al-qaṣī wal-dānī ilā tarājim shuyūkh al-Ṭabarānī (Riyadh: Dār al-Kayān, 2006), 594, no. 966); Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Muhammad al-Asghar al-Iṣbahānī, d. 144 or 5/761, mediocre transmitter, Mālik allegedly did not think highly of him, but narrated from him in the Muwaṭṭa’ (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 5:772 f., no. 7322); al-Munkadir b. Ḥumayd al-Anṣāri [sic], a corruption of names belonging to earlier transmitters (Mundhir, [Ibn] Abī Ḥumayd al-Anṣāri); Abū Ḥumayd al-Anṣāri al-Mardī, d. 284/897, a major informant of al-Taḥāwī (Badral-Dīn al-ʿAynī, Maghānī al-akhyār fi sharḥ asāmī rija‘ al-āthār, 2:685); ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd 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‘īd ‘Othmān,” in Encyclopaedia Iranica, edited by E. Yarshater (London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982–), 7:31 f.); Ya‘lā b. ‘Abayd b. Muḥammad al-Bazzāz al-Ṣabīrī, d. 284/897, a major informant of al-Taḥāwī (Ibn al-Bazzāz al-Ṣabīrī, al-Manṣūrī, 2:685); ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd 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‘īd ‘Othmān,” in Encyclopaedia Iranica, edited by E. Yarshater (London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982–), 7:31 f.); Ya‘lā b. ‘Abayd b. Umayya al-Iyādī al-Kūfī, d. 117/735, d. 209/825, mawlā, very high marks (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 7:226 f., no. 9170); Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf b. ‘Īsā b. Dinār al-Zuhri al-Marwazī, d. 249/863, well respected (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 7:244 f., 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-ʾitībār, 218f. The isnād given for this ḥadīth is corrupt: for Maḥmūd b. Iṣmāʿīl – Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, read Maḥmūd b. Iṣmāʿīl b. Muḥammad – Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn; Abu l-Walīd Hishām b. ‘Ammār al-Dimashqī, Ḥadīth Hishām b. ‘Ammār, edited by M. ʿAlī Ḥumayd (Riyadh: Dār Ḥishbīliyya, 1999), 391, no. 138; Aḥmad b. ‘Amr al-Deḥḥāk Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim, al-ʾĀḥādwa-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 nastāʾīn bi-l-kuffār); Ibn al-Mundhir, al-Awsat, 11:76, no. 6564; Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, edited by ʿA.M. ʿUmar, 11 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 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 mufassir (see n. 32 above);
– a version, without isnād, considerably interpreted, in Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Sarakhsi, Sharḥ kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr, edited by Ş. al-Munajjid, 5 vols. (Cairo: Maʿhad al-Makhtūṭat bi-Jāmiʿat al-Duwal al-ʿArabīya, 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-Zuhri [Medina/Syria]), in which the Anṣār ask why they do not seek the aid at Uḥud of their Jewish confederates (allā nastāʾīna bi-ḥulafāʾinā mina l-yahūd) – the Prophet responds lā ḥajata lanā fīhim (Saḥnūn b. Saʿīd 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

ʿAbd 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 hadīth he is known to narrate from ʿUrwa (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 3:588f., no. 4263); Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf al-Kalāʿī al-Miṣrī al-Tinniṣī, d. 218/833, originally Damascene, major transmitter from Mālik, good marks, settled in Egypt (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 3:714f., no. 4324); Abu l-ʿAbbās ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kalāʿī al-Miṣrī al-Tinniṣī, d. 218/833, originally Damascene, major transmitter from Mālik, good marks, settled in Egypt (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 3:714f., no. 4324); Abu l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb b. Yūsuf al-Sinānī al-Aṣamm al-Naysābūrī, d. 346/957, major figure, high marks (al-Dhahabī, Siyar, 15:452f., no. 258); Abu l-Mundhir Ismāʿīl b. ʿUrwa, was ca. 10 years old at the time of the expedition she describes (W. Montgomery Watt, s.n., in EI2); Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAli b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Mubashshir al-Wāṣiṭī, d. 324/936 (al-Dhahabī, Siyar, 15:25, no. 13); Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAli b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Qurashi al-Makhzūmī al-Kūfī al-Miṣrī (ʿAllān), d. 272/886, active, few but good marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 21:51ff., no. 4101); ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥafṣ b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥafṣ b. ʿAlī b. Baḥr al-Ḥāšimī al-Wāṣiṭī, d. 322/934, active, few but good marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 21:123f., no. 4186); Al-Fudayl b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh al-Madanī, d. ?, mawlā, narrates from Ibn Niyār and one other person, to Mālik and one other person, very obscure (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, 5:270f., no. 6402); Abu ʿAmr Ḥafṣ
b. 'Amr b. Rabāl al-Raqāshī al-Baṣrī, d. 258/872, good marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 7:52ff., no. 1413); Ibn Abī Uways = Ismā'īl b. 'Abd Allāh al-Madanī, d. 226/841, nephew of Mālik, well known but very weak (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 3:124ff., no. 459); Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Mahdi b. Ḥassān al-‘Anbarī al-Baṣrī, d. 198/814, pivotal transmitter, sterling marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 17:430ff., no. 3969); Ibn al-Mubārak = ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Rahmān al-Qāsim b. Khālid al-‘Utaqī, d. 191/806, the most important disciple of Mālik, key transmitter of his corpus, less so of hadīth, died in Egypt (Joseph Schacht, s.n., in EI²); Abū ‘Uthmān Sa‘īd b. Kathir Ibn ‘Ufayr al-Miṣrī, d. 226/841, learned, strongly mixed marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 11:36ff., no. 2344); Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb b. Musli al-Fihri al-Qurashi, d. 238/853, famous Egyptian pupil of Mālik (Jean David-Weill, s.n., in EI²).

Abū ʿAbd Allāh ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ibn al-Qāsim b. Ṭahtābī al-Balkhī, d. 268/882, very active, little discussed, few but positive marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 22:584ff., no. 4617); Iṣḥaq b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Mubārak al-‘Ijlī al-Rāzī, d. 248/862, mawlā, student of Ibn al-Qāsim, good marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 25:497ff., no. 5354); Muḥammad b. Ḥayyawayh = M. b. Yaḥyā b. Mūsā al-Isfarayini, d. 259/873, good marks, a local favorite in Isfarayin (Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rikh madīnat Dimashq, edited by A. Shīrī, 80 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995–1998), 56:232ff., no. 7102; al-Dhahabī, Siyar, 12:360ff., no. 153); Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ziyād b. Mārūf al-ʿIjlī al-Rāzī, d. 257/871, good marks, settled in the town of Jurjān (al-Sahmī, Taʾrīkh Jurjān (Hyderabad: Matbaʿat Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmānīya, 1950), 340, no. 639); Abū l-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Musaddad b. Musarbal al-Asadī al-Baṣrī, d. 228/843, well-known, high marks, odd name acknowledged (al-Mizzī, Tahdhīb, 27:443ff., no. 5899); Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ibrāhīm b. Ṣawādī al-Khuzaʿī al-Mawardi, d. 228/843, lived in Egypt and Baghdad, suspected of fabricating hadīth (Charles Pellat, s.n., in EI²); Muḥammad b. Shībīl 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 fi ʿuṣafāʾ al-rijāl, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984), 7:2480); Abū Muhammad Rawḥ b. ‘Ubāda b. al-ʿAlāʾ al-Baṣrī, d. 205/820, significant figure, mixed reviews (al-Mizzī, Tahdīb, 9:238, no. 1930); Abū l-Ḥusayn Ṣāliḥ b. Ahmad b. Yūnus b. Abī Muqāṭil al-Qirāṭī al-Harawī, d. 316/928, moved to Baghdād, notorious liar (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 10:447 f., no. 4818); Abū ‘Abd Allāh ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr b. al-Awwām al-Qurashi al-Asadi al-Madānī, d. 93/712, massively important early historian and transmitter (Görke/Schoeler, Urwa, passim; Gregor Schoeler, s.n., in EI²); Abū Sufyān Wākī b. al-Jarrāh b. Malik al-Kūfī, d. 197/812, a giant of hadīth transmission in his day (Raif Georges Houry, s.n., in EI²); Yahyā b. Maʿīn b. Abī al-Munārī al-Ghafarī al-Baṣrī, d. 233/847, major transmitter and hadīth critic (Fred Leemhuis, s.n., in EI²); Abū Saʿīd Yahyā b. Saʿīd b. Farrūkh al-Qaṭṭān al-Qurashi al-Ṭāhirī al-Madīnī, d. 316/928, extremely important early historian and transmitter (al-Mizzī, Tahdīb, 31:329 ff., no. 6834); Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā b. Ṣāliḥ al-Qurashi al-Sahmī al-Miṣrī, d. 282/896, mediocre marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdīb, 31:462 ff., no. 6883); Abū Mūsā Yaḥyā b. al-ʿAwāna b. ʿAbd al-Aʿlā b. Maysara al-Ṣadāfi al-Maṣrī, d. 282/896, major figure, high marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdīb, 32:513 ff., no. 7178); Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Habb b. Shaddād al-Nasāʾī, d. 234/849, settled in Baghdād, good marks (al-Mizzī, Tahdīb, 9:402 ff., no. 2010).

Sources
Abū ʿAwāna Yaḥyā b. Ishāq al-Isfarāyinī, Musnad Abī ʿAwāna, edited by A.ʿĀ. al-Dimashqī, 5 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, 1998), 4:339, no. 6900 f.; Abū Dāʿūd Sulaymān b. al-ʿAṣhāth al-Sijistānī, Sunan Abī Dāʿūd, edited by M. al-Khālidī, 3 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyya, 1996), 2:280, no. 2732; al-Bayhaqī, Sunan, 9:63, no. 17877; Ali b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī, al-Tāhirī, edited by M. al-Dābbāsī, 16 vols. (al-Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2006), 14:211, no. 3565; Abū Allāh b. Ṣādiq al-Harrānī, al-Ḥādhāmī, edited by M. al-Dabbāsī, 16 vols. (al-Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2007), 15:211, no. 3565; Abī al-Ḥusayn ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī, Sunan al-Dārimī, edited by F. Zamarrī and Kh. al-ʿĀlamī, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabī, 1987), 2:295, no. 2496 f.; Ibn ʿAdī, Kāmil, 7:2480, corroborated by an entry in Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Muḥammad b. Tāhir al-Maqdisī, Dhakhīr al-ṣḥīfāʾ, edited by A. al-Fayyāwī, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Dar al-Salaf, 1996), 5:2618, no. 6098 (with the apparently erroneous remark that only al-Nuʿmān 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-ʿArnaʿūt and N. al-ʿIrqsūsī, 52 vols. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1993–2008), 2:450, no. 24386, 42:80 f., no. 25158, whence Abī al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Taḥqīq fī aḥādīth al-khīlāf, edited by M. al-Saʿīdānī, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyya, 1994–), 2:242, no. 1872, cf. the version traced to Ibn Ḥanbal in Ḥanbal b. Muḥammad al-Khallāl, Ahl al-milal.
wal-ridda ... min Kitāb al-jāmī’, edited by I. b. H. b. Sulṭān (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Ma‘ārif, 1996), 1195 f., no. 332; Ibn Ḥībbān (d. 354/965) = Ibn Balabān = ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Ali b. al-Fārisī, al-Iḥsān fī taqrīb Ṣaḥīh Ibn Ḥībbān, edited by Sh. al-Arna‘ūṭ, 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-Tāḥdhib, 16:232 f., and Abū Bakr b. al-Muqrī’ al-Iṣbahānī, al-Muntakhab min gharāʾib 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 Ḥībbān); Ibn Jārūd = ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali al-Naysābūrī, Kitāb al-muntaqā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ālamīya, 1996), 398 f., no. 1048; Ibn Māja = Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Qazwīnī, al-Sunan, edited by Sh. al-Arna‘ūṭ, 5 vols. (Damascus: Dār al-Risāla al-‘Ālamīya, 2009), 41010, no. 2832; Ibn al-Mundhir, al-Awsat, 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-Abāṭīlwa-l-manākīrwa-l-ṣiḥāḥwa-l-mashāhīr, edited by ʿA. al-Faryawāʾī, 2 vols. (Benares: Idāratal-Buḥūthal-Islāmīya, 1983), 2:201 f.); Ibn Sa’d, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, 3:496; Ishāq b. Rāhawayh, Musnad, edited by ‘A. al-Balūshi, 5 vols. (Medina: Maktabat al-Imān, 1990–1995), 2:256, no. 759 216; Iṣmā‘īl b. Ishāq al-Jahdānī al-Azdī al-Qāḍī, al-Juzʾal-khāmisminmusnad Mālik b. Anas, edited by M. Muranyi (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2002), 70 f., no. 116; Muslim b. al-Ḥajjājal-Qushayrī, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, edited by M.F. ‘Abd al-Bāqi, 5 vols. (Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾal-Kutubal-ʿArabīya, 1955–1956), 3:1449, no. 1817, whence by an isnād to al-Ḥāzimī, Kitāb al-iʿtibār, 217 f.; al-Nasāʾī, Aḥmad b. Shuʿayb, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā, edited by Sh. al-Arna‘ūṭ, 12 vols. (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 2001), 8:85, no. 8797, 147, no. 8835, 10:304, no. 11536 whence by an isnād to Khalaf b. ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Bashkuwāl, Kitāb ghawāmiḍ al-asmāʾ al-mubahama, 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. Sałama, see ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jawhari, Musnad al-Muwatṭa’, edited by L. al-Ṣaghīr and Ţ. Būsariḥ (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1997), 494 f., no. 628, according to which the tradition was found in three recensions of the Muwatṭa’, a point confirmed by Aḥmad b. Tāhir al-Dānī, Kitāb al-imāʾilā atrāf aḥādīth Kitāb al-muwatṭa’, edited by ‘A. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Ma‘ārif, 2003), 4:469 f., no. 53); Saḥnūn, Mudawwana, 1:525 f.; al-Ṭaḥāwī, 6:407 ff., no. 2572–2576; Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā al-Tirmidhī, Sunan al-Tirmidhī, 10 vols. (Ḥimṣ: Maṭābiʿal-Fajral-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. Khālid al-Sulamī al-Īṣbahānī, d. 296/909, minor figure, described as ṣāḥib usūl (al-Manṣūrī, Irshād, 389, no. 602); ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Juʿfī al-Bukhārī al-Musnadi, d. 229/844, high marks, said to have brought hadith from Wāṣiṭ to Bukhārā, transmitted 44 hadith to the famous al-Bukhārī (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 3:642f., no. 4162); Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawḥ al-Madāʾinī, d. 277/890, indifferent marks, minor figure (al-Dhahabī, Siyar, 13:5, no. 1); Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Dashtakī, d. ?, high marks (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 4:73f., no. 4755); ‘Abd 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. Mālik al-Qaṭīʿī al-Ḥanbalī al-Baghdādī, d. 268/882, high marks, transmitted works of Ibn Ḥanbal (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 5:116f., no. 1966); Abū Jaʿfar ʿĪsā b. Abī ʿĪsā Māhān al-Rāzī al-Tamīmī, d. ?, mawlā, also linked to Baṣra and Khurāsān, mixed marks tending to negative (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 7:328f., no. 9484); Abū ʿUmar al-Qāsimī b. Jaʿfar b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid al-Hāshimi, a Baṣran ʿAlid, d. 414/1024, qāḍī, respected transmitter (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 14:462f., no. 6887); Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Manṣūr b. Sayyār al-Rāzī, d. 265/878, active in Baghdad, mixed marks tending to positive (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 6:362f., no. 2856); Abū Masʿūd ʿAlī b. Shayba b. ʿAlī, above; Abū l-ʿAbbās ʿAlī b. Shayba b. Ṣalt al-Sadūsī, d. 272/885, mawlā, Baṣrān who lived in Baghdad for a time but settled in Egypt, good marks (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 13:393f., no. 6285); ‘Amr b. ‘Ali, above; Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān b. ʿAbd al-Shaybānī al-Ṭabarānī, 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, 2:703f., no. 724); Abū Ṣaʿd b. Ṣaʿd b. ʿAmr b. Ṣaʿd al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī, d. 132/749, narrated to Mālik as well as Mustalim, minor, little-known transmitter (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 2:308f., no. 2017); Klāb b. Ṣawāf/d. 303/915, minor figure much cited by al-Ṭabarānī, peripatetic (al-Manṣūrī, Irshād, 289, no. 399); Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad, Ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Muqriʾ, d. 293/905, minor figure, described as ṣāḥib usūl (al-Manṣūrī, Irshād, 389, no. 602); Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad, Ibn al-Atθram al-Muqrī, d. 336/947–948, generally high marks, moved from Baghdad to Baṣra, where al-Ḥashimi heard from him (al-Khaṭīb, TMS, 2:80f., no. 47); Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh, above; Abu l-Ḥārith Khubayb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khubayb al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī al-Madinī, d. 132/749, narrated to Mālik as well as Mustalim, minor, little-known transmitter (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 2:308f., no. 2017); Khubayb b. Ṣawāf/Iṣāf 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. Khayyāṯ, Kīṭāb al-
 ūmān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḫārīfī al-Kūfī, d. 234/849, major figure, glowing marks, visit to Wāṣīt expressly mentioned (al-Mizzī, Tahdhib, 25:976 ff., no. 5379); Abū ‘Amr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Hamdān al-Ḥirā, d. 376/987, musnad Khurāsān, major figure, high marks, transmission from al-Ḥasan at sixteen expressly mentioned (al-Dḥahābī, Sīyar, 16:356 ff., no. 254); Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Yarbrough - 9789004386549
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Muṣannaf, 6:487, no. 33159; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, 25:42, no. 15763, whence Ibn al-Jawzī, Taḥqiq, 2:342, no. 1873; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, 3:496; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Muwaḍḍiḥ, 1:209f.; 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-Ṭāḥāwī, Sharḥ, 413f., no. 2577f.

Cf.
- the colorful, detailed version via a combined mursal isnād (al-Wāqidī – Ibn Jurayj al-Makkī – Abān b. Ṣāliḥ al-Madanī – Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib al-Madanī [not a Companion]), lacking the distinctive phrasing of our three hadīth, in al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-magḥāzī, 1:46f.
- an abbreviated version without an isnād in Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, above
- a distinct hadīth alluding to the same incident, without names, and giving Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Kalbī al-Kūfī (d. 146/763) as ultimate authority (via Abū Yusuf 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-Wāqidī’s account (above).
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