

De 11670  
(1/2)

1877











1877 (1)



Acc. 1877

Alfred von Kremer's edition of *Wakidy*. 31

Notes on ALFRED VON KREMER'S edition of *Wakidy's Campaigns*.—  
By A. SPRENGER, M. D.

(FIRST NOTICE).

In June, 1854, when at Alexandria, I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of the distinguished orientalist, Alfred von Kremer. He showed me a very valuable copy of the campaigns of *Wakidy*. I induced him to edit it in the *Bibliotheca Indica* and recommended it to the Asiatic Society of Bengal. On my return to India in February, 1856, I had the pleasure of seeing it printed. Being probably better acquainted with the subject than any one else, and having several books which were not at the disposal of the learned editor, I undertake to write some remarks on the work. I beg, however, in the commencement to express the high sense which I entertain of Mr. Von Kremer's erudition and industry evinced in this, as well as, in his previous labours.

The Musalmans applied in early times the principles of judicial evidence to the historical criticism of traditions and showed an aversion against admitting written testimony alone, though sometimes they were obliged to acknowledge it, as we shall see lower down. In their opinion an account found in a book has no historical value, unless you have a witness who has been assured by the author himself that every part of the book is genuine or who has received this assurance from another witness who again may have received it from another up to the author. In olden times, it was usual to write the string of witnesses up to the author into every fasciculus of the book in three places: first on the title page, then in the commencement of the text and then again at the end. The form in which it is written is different in each of these three places. In writing the Arabic title page to Von Kremer's book, I restored and completed the original form from the editor's preface. In the last *riwáyat* I used the word "wijádatan." This is a technical term which is explained by *Tyby* as follows: الوجدادة من وجد تيجد مولد و هو ان يقف على كتاب بخط شيخ فيه احاديث ليس له رواية ما فيها فله ان يقول وجدت او قرأت بخط فلان *Wijadáh* is a newly coined word and derived

V. 66. 6. 6.

from the verb *wajad* "to find." It means that A. B. has got hold of a book containing *hadythes* in the handwriting of a *Shaykh*, but the contents of the book have not been verbally or by *ijazah* communicated to him. In this case A. B. must not say *alchbaraná* "I have been informed," but he must say "I have found," or "I have read in the hand-writing of C. D." or "in a book written in the hand writing of C. D."

In *Iráqy's* *Alfyah*, it is explained nearly in the same terms :

ثم الوجداء وذلك مصدر \* وجدته مولدا ليظهر  
تغاير المعنى وذاك ان نجد \* بخط من عاصرت او قبل عهد  
ما لم يحدثك به ولم يجهز \* فقل بخطه وجدته او احتوز  
ان لم يتفق بالخط قل وجدته \* عنه او اذكر قيل او ظننت

"The last [and least satisfactory mode of propagating *hadythes*] is the *wijádah*. This is a verbal noun from *wajad* "to find," it has been newly coined with a view of distinguishing this meaning from other meanings of this root [as *wijdán* which is used if it means "to feel" or *wojúd* "existence."] The term *wijádah* is used if you find *hadythes* in the handwriting of one of your contemporaries or a man of bye-gone days, whose lectures you have not heard and from whom you do not hold an *ijazah*. In this case you say "I have found in his hand-writing." But if you are not quite sure whether it is his hand-writing you must be on your guard, and you merely say "I found this *hadyth* from A. B." or you use the expressions "It is said" or "I believe."

Pages 1, 17, 43, 69, 95, 121, 149, 178, 206, 229, 255, 281, 306 and 357 of *Kremer's* text and p. 35 of *Lees's* *Fotúh al-Shám* contain specimens of the manner in which the string of authorities is stated in the commencement of every fasciculus. It is distinctly mentioned in the MS. of *Fotúh* that where the *isnád* stands commenced in the original, the second fasciculus.

A specimen of a *Samá* or the form in which it is written at the end of each fasciculus will be found lower down. As I have prepared for the press a work\* on "the Canons of Historical criticism

\* This work is a translation of the *Tyqryb wa Taysyr* of *Nawawy* illustrated with notes from *Soyúty's* commentary on it, from *Nawawy's* *Irshád*, *Ibn Caláh's* 'olúm *alhadyyth*, *Iráqy's* *Afyah* and its two commentaries, from the dictionary of the technical terms used in traditions, from the *I'lám* of *Qádhyy* 'Iyádh (a very



of the Musalmans" which will contain a very full account of all these matters, I deem it loss of time to dwell here any further on this subject than to the extent it was necessary to make intelligible what follows.

Mr. Von Kremer's copy is what I call an *authenticated* one. It was written by Más'úd b. 'Alyy for Abú-l-*Hasan* 'Alyy Ibn al-Tarráh. In order to comply with the above condition—to have a witness that every part of the work is genuine, and to correct his copy, Ibn al-Tarráh read it in A. H. 532 before his Shaykh Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy who compared what he read with his own copy. Subsequently, in 549, Mas'úd b. 'Alyy copied from the MS. of the Shaykh the Sama' into it. It was usual, for the Shaykh, if pupils read, to say in the commencement of each lecture, Akhbaraná fulán, i. e. "What thou art going to read, has been communicated to me and my fellow-students by A. B." Or the Shaykh remained silent and the pupil read Akhbarakum, i. e. "C. D. has communicated to thee and thy school-fellows what follows." This form is used here. Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy had been instructed in the book by Jawhary. In this instance the book was read by a fellow-student of Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy and he as well as the Shaykh (Jawhary) were listening.

The instructor of Jawhary, and his witness for the authenticity of the book was Ibn Hayyúyah a pupil of Ibn Aby Hayyah before whom his own copy was read by a student and he (Abú Hayyah) as well as Ibn Hayyúyah listened and he (Abú Hayyah) stated that it was really what he had heard from his teacher al-Háarith Thalji (died at the age of 76 in 206?) who had attended Wákidy's own lectures. Mr. Kremer gives us learned notices of some of these persons. It so happens that some of them are links in the chain of witnesses through which the Cawnpore copy of Ibn Sa'd was propagated to the celebrated biographer of Moḥammad, Háfitz Dimyáty, the teacher of Hakkáry, by whom that copy was copied from Ibn Hayyúyah's text in 718. The isnád in the com-  
rare work) from the *تقييد العلم* of the Khatyb Baghdády which treats on the introduction and progress of writing among the Moslims for the sake of preserving traditions, and throws a flood of light on the literary history of the first two centuries—and from a number of other works. My labour is nearly finished, but I left it among my books at Damascus, which have not yet reached me.

mencement of Ibn Sa'd runs : اخبرنا الشيخ الامام العالم الحافظ العلامة : النسابة شرف الدين ابو محمد عبد المومن بن خلف بن ابي الحسن الدمياطي رحمه الله قراءة عليه وانا اسمع قال انا الشيخ الامام محدث الشام ومسنده شمس الدين ابو الحجاج يوسف بن خليل بن عبد الله الدمشقي يقال انا ( اخبركم read ) ابو محمد عبد الله بن دهيل بن علي بن كارة انا القاضي ابو بكر بن محمد بن عبد الباقي بن محمد بن عبد الله الانصاري انا ابو محمد الحسن بن علي بن محمد بن الحسن بن عبد الله الجوهري عن ابي عمر محمد بن العباس بن محمد بن زكريا بن يحيى بن معاذ بن حيوية الخزاز عن ابي الحسن احمد بن معروف بن بشر بن موسى الخشاب عن ابي محمد الحارث بن محمد بن ابي اسامة التيمي عن ابي عبد الله محمد بن سعد \*

At the end of Ibn Sa'd we find several Samás which have been copied by Hakkary from more ancient MSS. A Samá is like a college certificate: its object is to record the names of those persons who were authorized to propagate the work or part into which it is written, and the names of the witnesses upon whose testimony their authority rests. I insert here the first of these Samás because I have never yet found either a Moslim or Christian who could make head or tail of this description of documents. Yet they are not without interest, and if we understand one, we can make them out all.

شاهدت بخط شيخنا الامام الحافظ ابي محمد عبد المومن الدمياطي رحمه الله تعالى يقول صورة سماع الجزء الثاني من اجزا ابن حيوية الخزاز [قرأ] على ابن حيوية الحسن والحسين ابنا علي بن محمد الجوهري بغير تاريخ وسبعة من ابي محمد الحسن الجوهري جماعة بقراءة ابي بكر الخطيب لبعضه وبعضه بقراءة عبد الله بن سبعون القراوني ابو بكر محمد بن عبد الباقي بن محمد البزاز في ربيع الاول سنة ٨٤٣هـ وسمعه منه بقراءة الخطيب ابوطالب عبد القادر بن محمد بن عبد القادر بن يوسف و ابو محمد الحسن و ابو الحسن على ابنا عبد الملك بن محمد [بن] يوسف و ابو ظاهر عبد الرحمن بن احمد بن عبد القادر بن محمد بن يوسف و محمد بن عبد الباقي الدوروي و احمد بن ثابت غلام بن الشعري في ربيع الاخر ١٤٧٧هـ سمعه من القاضي ابي بكر محمد بن عبد الغفار يسماعه من الجوهري بقراءة ابي المعالي مبارك بن هبة الله بن سليمان (سلمون) بن الصباغ ابو الحسن [عبد الله بن] دهيل بن علي بن كارة و ولده عبد الله و ابو ياسر [بن] عبد الوهاب [بن هبة الله بن عبد الوهاب] بن ابي حية و [ابو الفرج] عبد الرحمن بن علي بن محمد بن الجوزي الواظ و ابو ماهر يحيى بن مقبل بن الصدر في ثامن من جمادى الاخرة سنة ٥٢٩هـ [سمعه] بقراءة عبد الكريم بن محمد السمعاني مسعود بن علي بن عبد



الله بن احمد الصفار في مفرسنة ٥٣٥هـ وسمعه من ابي محمد عبد الله بن كارة بقرأة ابي طالب عبد المحسن بن ابي العميد بن خالد (عبد الغفار) الحنفي الابيهري وولده [ابو] عبد الله الحصري (الحسين) و ابو الحسن [محمد بن علي بن الحسن (الحسين)] بن يوسف الهمداني وولده ابو عبد الله (ابو القفا) محمد و ابو محمد يوسف بن ابي جعفر السرقى الدياس و يوسف بن خليل بن عبد الله الدمشقي في جمادى الاولى (ربيع الاول) سنة ٥٨٩هـ وسمعه [من] ابن كارة بقرأة محمد بن ابي بكر بن ابي السعادات بن الراس جماعة منهم ابو الحسن بن محمد بن يحيى بن حكيم البغدادي و اخرون في ربيع الاول سنة ٥٧٩هـ وسمعه من ابن كارة محمد بن عبد الله بن احمد بن قدامة و ابن احمد بن عبد الله و احمد بن عبد الدار بن نعمة المقدسيون و عبد الرشيد بن محمد بن علي بن احمد المستدي بقرائه في جمادى الاولى سنة ٥٩٥هـ فعلته حرفا بحرف كما شاهدته كتبه احمد الهكاري \*

To understand the above, it is necessary that the reader should know that the standard copy of Ibn Sa'd—that written by Ibn *Hayyúyah*,\* was divided into eight parts, and that at the end of every part, the teachers and pupils who read it, wrote their *samá*.<sup>7</sup> Hakkáry transcribed the more important *Samá*'s into his copy and attached to every one his signature. This is the technical meaning of كتبه if it stands at the end of a document. We also find at the end of some documents العبد before the name of a witness and this word is therefore also used for "witness" or "signature."

The *samá* quoted above was written in the hand of the celebrated *Háfitz Dimyáty*, and it referred to the second part of the original. It appears from it that that part was read alternately by al-*Hasan al-Jawhary* mentioned above and his brother al-*Hosayn* (and as we learn from other *samá*'s also all other parts of the book were read by them) before Ibn *Hayyúyah*. Subsequently in 447 the book was read before *Hasan Jawhary* by the *Khatyb Abú Bakr* in the presence of six pupils, none of whom is of any interest, and in 448 it was read under his (*Jawhary*'s) superintendence partly by the same *Khatyb Abú Bakr* and partly by 'Abd Allah *Qarawany*, and it was on this occasion that Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy *Bazzáz* who has been mentioned above was present. Under the superintendence of Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy [*Bazzáz*] who taught the book in the version of *Jawhary*, it

هو بالفتح الحاء المهملة ثم مثناة تحت مضمومة مشددة و بعد الواو مثناة \*  
 نُورُ النُّبْرِاسِ، p. 1988. تحت مفتوحة ثم الها

was also twice read, once in 529 by Ibn Hibat Allah and among the auditory were Dahyal and the celebrated 'Abd al-Rahmán Ibn Jawzy and it was again read before the old man in 535 by Sam'any. I must here observe that reading a book before a Shaykh for the sake of the isnád was a mere boast and ceremony, and therefore, students flocked to a man who had heard it a long while ago, however infirm he might be, from all parts of the Mohammadan world, in order that there might be few links between themselves and the author. This explains how it came that the old man lectured on a work which he had studied 87 years previously.

The rest of the above document offers neither any difficulty nor much interest and I therefore, confine my explanations to these few remarks.

From another Samá' we learn that Ibn Hayyúyah lectured on the book in 318 and again in 320 in his own house. It farther appears from one of the Samá's and from the isnád of Ibn Sayyid alnás that the Qádhíy Abú Bakr [Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy] had two riwáyats of the text of Ibn Hayyúyah, that of Jawhary—and this riwáyat he transmitted to Abú 'Abd Allah b. Dahyal and others—and the riwáyat of Abú Isháq Ibráhyim b. 'Omar Barmaky, equally a pupil of Ibn Hayyúyah, which he had received by ijázah only. This explains why it is distinctly added above *بسماعة عن الجوهري* i. e. "Ibn 'Abd al-Báqiy taught the book as he had heard it from Jawhary." It is also stated that Ibn Hayyúyah mentioned before every hadyth his isnád up to the author. In referring to Kremer's text of *Wakidy*, we find that he did the same in teaching that book and that this objectionable practice was also adopted by his pupil Jawhary. \* Every isnád therefore, begins with "I heard from Moḥammad [Ibn Hayyúyah] who had it from 'Abd al-Wahláb, from Moḥammad [Thaljy]. This may perhaps justify the supposition that the standard copy upon which Kremer's text is founded, was that of Jawhary. Perhaps we may go farther and suppose that the omissions, and additions to be noticed lower down have been made by him. His giving the full isnád for every single hadyth seems to me to indicate that he did not yet consider the work as a whole but as an aggregate of documents of which he considered himself at liberty to take as many as he pleased or suited his purpose.



It is curious that Ibn Sayyid alnás, the author of the *'Oyún alathar* has used a copy of Ibn Sa'd and quotes a riwáyat for it nearly identical with the Cawnpore codex. He says:

وما كان فيه عن محمد بن سعد فمن كتاب الطبقات الكبير له وقد قرأت معظم هذا الكتاب على الشيخ الامام بهاء الدين ابي محمد عبد المحسن ابن صاحب محي الدين محمد بن احمد بن هبة الله بن ابي جرادة العقيلي واجاز جميع ما يرويه وكان سمعته كاملا من الحافظ ابي الحجاج يوسف بن خليل بن عبد الله الدمشقي وذهبت يسير من اصل سماعة فلم نقيده عليه حين قرأت اياه عليه قال ابن خليل اثنا ابومحمد عبد الله بن زهيل بن علي بن منصور بن ابراهيم بن كارة سمعا عليه ببغداد قال انا القاضي ابو بكر محمد بن عبد الباقي بن محمد بن عبد الله الانصاري عن ابي محمد الحسن بن علي الجوهري قال انا ابو عمر محمد بن العباس بن زكريا بن حيوية قال قرأ علي ابو الحسن احمد بن معروف بن بشر بن موسى الخشاب و انا اسمع في شعبان سنة ثمان عشرة وثلثمائة قال انا ابو محمد الحرث بن محمد بن ابي اسامة التميمي انا ابن سعد هذا الاسناد من اول الكتاب التي اخر ما فيه من خبر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم \*

I may here add that it appears that Ibn Sayyid alnás had no copy of *Wákidy*, he had only Ibn Sa'd.

Having done with the isnád of Mr. Kremer's copy, let us proceed to the authorities whom *Wákidy* quotes but in order more fully to illustrate the subject, I may be allowed to say a few words on Ibn Sa'd's authorities.

It is the praiseworthy habit of Ibn Sa'd to trace for every fact, he states the testimony up to an eye-witness but he deviates from this rule in his chapter on "the campaigns." Here he quotes at the head (folio 98) the four leading works on the subject. The statements contained in these four books, he works up according to the best of his own judgment,\* without referring to them in the details. But where he supplies statements from other authorities, as he does sometimes, he gives the Isnád. These four works are 1. The campaigns of *Wáqidy* which he received immediately from the author. 2. The work of Ibn Ishák which he took on the testimony of Rowaym b. Yazyd Moqriy who had it on the testimony of Hárún b. Aby 'Ysà and Ibn Aby 'Ysà was a pupil of Ibn Ishák himself. 3. The work of Abú Ma'shar [*Nojayh* b. Abd al-Rahmán d. 175] which he took on the testimony of al-*Hosayn* b. Mohámmad

\* The technical term for such a process is حديث بعض في حديث بعضهم

a pupil of the author. 4. The work of Músà b. 'Oqbah [a client of the Zobayr family, d. 141]\* which he took on the testimony of Isma'yil b. 'Abd Allah b. Oways Madany who had it from a nephew of the author, Isma'yil b. Ibráhyim b. 'Oqbah and he had it from the author himself. I insert here Ibn Sa'd's own words:

اخبّرنا محمد بن عمر بن واقد الأسلمي اخبّرنا عمر بن عثمان بن عبد الرحمن بن سعيد بن يربوع المخزومي وموسى بن محمد بن ابراهيم بن الحرث التيمي ومحمد بن عبد الله ابن مسلم ابن اخي الزهري وموسى بن يعقوب بن عبد الله بن وهب بن زمعة بن الأسود وعبد الله بن جعفر بن عبد الرحمن بن المسور بن مخرمة الزهري ويحيى بن عبد الله بن ابي قتادة الأنصاري وربيعة بن عثمان بن عبد الله بن الهدير التيمي و ابراهيم بن اسمعيل بن ابي حبيبة الأشهلي وعبد الحميد بن جعفر الحكمي وعبد الرحمن بن ابي الزناد ومحمد بن صالح التمار قال محمد بن سعد واخبرني رويم بن يزيد المقرئ اخبّرنا هارون بن ابيه عيسى عن محمد بن اسحق واخبرني حسين بن محمد عن ابي معشر واخبرنا اسمعيل بن عبد الله بن ابي اويس المدني عن اسمعيل بن ابراهيم ابن عقبة عن عمه موسى بن عقبة دخل حديث بعضهم في حديث بعض \*

In reading over this passage of Ibn Sa'd, we would hardly suspect that he refers to books and if we did not know from other sources that these four men to whom he refers had written down their statements, we might suppose that he received from them merely oral traditions.

Wakidy like Ibn Sa'd does not give the isnád for every fact but he mentions in the first page twenty-six Shaykhs on whose testimony he had received the statements which he worked into one continuous narrative. Among them occur Abú Ma'shar and Isma'yil b. Ibráhyim Ibn 'Oqbah, of these two we know distinctly that they taught complete, original works on the campaigns of the prophet and it may be asserted with certainty of the remaining twenty-four Shaykhs that they were teaching books or collectanea, because the method in which in those days traditions were taught was, that one of the pupils read and the Shaykh listened to his reading and made the necessary corrections. The remaining pupils in some instances wrote down what he read, and hence the term

\* See my remarks on these two works in an article in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* Vol. 20. "On the earliest biographies of Mo'hammad."

كُتِبَت الْحَدِيثَ مِنْ فُلَانٍ which means generally "I have taken traditions on his authority." Or they were also provided with copies and compared them with what he read. It is however, impossible to say how many of these twenty-four Shaykhs lectured on systematic works on the biography of the prophet, and how many taught *Masnads* and *Moçannafs*, i. e. miscellaneous collections of traditions. I hope in a future article to be able to give a somewhat fuller account on the authorities regarding the biography of *Moçammad* which were extant at the time of *Wákidy* and of some of the Shaykhs of this writer, than at present, and I therefore refrain from entering here on this subject.

Now I come at length to the text of *Wákidy*. He begins with a list of all the campaigns and assassinations in which *Moçammad* was the leader, or which were undertaken by his orders. This list is followed by detailed accounts of each, but in the detailed accounts very little notice is taken of the expedition of *Hamzah*, which took place in March 623, that of *'Obaydah* which took place in April of the same year, that of *Sa'd b. Aby Waqqác*, May, 623, that of *Moçammad* to *Abwá*, in August, that to *Bowát* in September and the pursuit of *Kurz*. This omission is not due to *Wákidy* but to one of the *ráwies*—probably *Jawhary*. At the time of *Tabary*, other more complete texts were extant, but he does unfortunately not say by whom. Every *hadyth* was originally considered as a whole in itself. Consequently early *ráwies* (persons who transmitted a book or *hadyth*) did not think it admissible to *alter* a *hadyth* or to omit *part* of it. But from a collection of *Hadythes*, they considered it allowable to omit as many as they pleased without incurring any censure, and they might insert new ones, faithfully quoting their authorities. Again, where the author of the collection states his view on the subject, the *Ráwiy* might suppress it and give his own. This liberty has not only been taken with *Wákidy* but to a very great extent with the *Muättá*, and to some extent even with *Bokháry* where the fullest and the most defective *riwáyat* (edition) vary in the number of *hadythes* by more than two hundred. Fortunately this habit came early out of fashion but not sufficiently early to preserve for us the text of *Wákidy* in its integrity.



I insert here a passage from *Tabary* from which it appears that the *Ráwiys* did make slight omissions :

قال ابو جعفر زعم الواقدي ان رسول الله عقد في هذه السنة ... لخمزة  
لوا ابيض ... وان رسول الله عقد ايضا في هذه السنة على راس ثمانية  
اشهر في شوال لعبيدة بن الحارث بن المطلب بن عبد مناف لوا ابيض وامر  
بالسير الى بطن رابغ وان اللوا كان مع مسطح بن اثالة فبلغ ثنية المرة وهي  
بناحية الجحفة في ستين من المهاجرين ليس فيهم انصاري وانهم التقوهم  
المشركون على ماء يقال له احيا وكان بينهم الرمي دون المسابقة وقد اختلفوا  
في امير السرية وقال بعضهم كان ابو سفيان بن حرب وقال بعضهم كان مكر  
بن حفص قال ابو جعفر قال الواقدي ورايت التثبت على ابي سفيان بن حرب  
كان في مايتين من المشركين \*

"*Tabary* observes: *Wákidy* fancies that the Messenger of God appointed in this year, *Hamzah*, leader of an expedition and tied a white flag to his spear, and that the Messenger of God tied also, in *Shawwál*, in the eighth month after the flight, a white flag to a spear for 'Obaydah and sent him to *Batn Rábigh*. This standard was borne by *Mistaḥ*. The expedition consisted of sixty refugees and no *Anḡary*, and it proceeded as far as *al-Morraḥ* in the neighbourhood of *al-Joḥfah*. They met the enemy at *Ahya* and there were some arrows exchanged, but it did not come to close combat with the sword. The accounts do not agree as to the leader of the caravan. Some say, it was *Abú Sofyán* and some say *Mikraz*. *Tabary* says: the words of *Wákidy* are "I consider it as settled that *Abú Sofyán* was the leader and that the caravan was defended by two hundred men." It is true, *Tabary* gives at first merely an abstract of *Wákidy's* statements, but Arabic authors always preserve the words of the original and at the end *Tabary* quotes *Wákidy's* own words. In referring to *Kremer's* text, we find that neither these words are in it, nor is the rest of the story so full. There are other quotations in *Tabary*, which are not found complete in *Kremer's* original. In another place we find *Ibn 'Oqbah* quoted, and the manner in which it is done, leads us to suspect that this quotations is one of the many addition of a *ráwiy* to *Wákidy's* text.

The first affair regarding which *Wákidy* enters into very valuable details is the expedition of *Ibn Jaḥsh*. This infamous exploit throws much light on the character of *Mohammad* and I therefore, give here an account of it. If the reader pays attention to the authorities

which I quote, he will observe how useful *Wakidy* is for tracing the history of that period.

Most of the refugees had neither friends at *Madynah* nor any means of subsistence. The number of men—exclusive of women and children—who were destitute is calculated to four hundred.\* However great the charity of those of their brethren might be who were in easier circumstances, it must have been altogether insufficient to relieve their sufferings. The mosque which the prophet had built was filled with men who were houseless. Here they slept at night and sought shelter during the day against the scorching rays of the sun. This mosque, it appears, consisted of a low terrace, walled in on three sides, open on the fourth towards the court-yard and provided with a roof. Such a building is called *Soffah*† and

\* “The persons alluded to are the poor people among the refugees who amounted to about four hundred men. They had neither dwellings nor friends in *Madynah*. They employed themselves in studying the *Korân* in the mosque and in picking date-stones. They were ready to proceed on any expedition the prophet might send them on. These are the men of the *Soffah*.” (*Baghawy Commr. Kor. 2, 274.*)

The mosque would not have afforded shelter to four hundred men and during the first and second year after the flight, the total number of refugees did not much exceed that number and subsequently when they were successful in war the number of destitute Moslems was much diminished by death in battle and by the acquisition of booty. *Ibn Sa'd* folio 49 has two traditions, one of *Abú Horayrah* who was himself one of the men of the *Soffah* and one of *Mozammad b. Ka'b*, according to both the number of men who lived in the mosque amounted only to thirty. According to a tradition of *Abú Horayrah* in *Bokháry* they amounted to seventy. But these traditions refer to a very late period for *Abú Horayrah* states what he saw and experienced himself and he embraced the *Islám* very late. I therefore suppose that four hundred or less was the number of all the destitute Moslems, and that about one-fourth of them say seventy, who were more miserable than the rest lived in the mosque. The latter alone can properly be called the men of the *Soffah*, but at a later period it was apparently applied to all destitute refugees. Daily changes must have taken place, some leaving the *Soffah* and others taking their place, and therefore an attempt at too great precision would be a sure road to error.

† This is the meaning which the word has in *Ibn al-Banná* and which it retains up to this day in *Masakat*. Such a place is now called *Lywán*, at *Damascus* whilst the word *soffah* has quite a different meaning in *Syria* and *Egypt*, on which see *Kremer's Mittelsyrien* and *Lane's Modern Egyptians*. Yet I have been assured at *Damascus* that a *Lywán* with a flat roof may be called a *Soffah*.

hence these men who were apparently more wretched than the rest, are known as the men of *Soffah*. They offered a miserable spectacle, many of them had no other clothing at day nor any other covering for the night, than a rag tied round the waist.\* On one occasion 'Aly got a courtain as his share of the booty and he made a present of it to these men. The prophet took it and cut out aprons for as many as it yielded. Some had rags tied round their neck which came down to their thighs and they were so transparent that they were obliged in walking to hold them together in front with their hands to cover their nakedness.† They were also very unclean: Their rags swarmed with vermin and they exhaled a most offensive smell.‡ At supper time the prophet would invite some of them to partake of his own meal and the rest he distributed over the houses of his wealthier followers, whom he exhorted in the *Korân* to be charitable towards them.§ Yet notwithstanding these efforts they suffered so much of hunger, even towards the end of the prophet's earthly career in the days of prosperity of the Moslim community, that Abú Horayrah relates that he fainted from starvation.|| Immediately after the Hijrah their wretchedness must have been much greater.

The only outlet for these desperate men was bloodshed and robbery. The Messenger of God waylaid every Qorayshite caravan that went to the north. But in vain. They were in so great number and their precautions were so complete that, during the first sixteen months, all his efforts proved abortive. On the contrary, Kurz suc-

\* Ibn Sa'd, folio 49, and Bokháry.

† *Majma' albahrayn*, *sub voce sff*.

‡ *Ta'arruf* and the commentary thereon, a work on Sufism, p. 8, I have however, only the Persian translation.

§ "Whatever charity you spend, give to those poor men who have been disabled for the sake of the cause of God, they cannot go about in the world, ignorant persons consider them rich on account of their modesty, but you may recognize them by their appearance. They do not beg with importunity," 2, 274. Most commentators of the *Korân* and Ibn Sa'd fol. 49 maintain that this verse refers to the men of the *Soffah*. If so, it was revealed very late, when only men who were not fit for war were poor.

|| Baghawy, *loco cit*.



ceeded in carrying away the flocks of the inhabitants of Madynah. The failure of Mohammad, and the success of his enemies must have made a very unfavorable impression on the population of Madynah, on the friends as well as the enemies of the Islám. Being driven to extremities, he planned immediately on his return from the chase of Kurz, towards the end of December, 623, a most desperate expedition.

It consisted of twelve men\* who were mounted on half that number of dromedaries, two men riding one animal in turn. He first offered the command over the party to Abú 'Obaydah,† and as he refused to accept it, he appointed his own cousin 'Abd Allah b. Jaʿsh to it, whom he had employed on a similar occasion the preceding year, and he conferred upon him, as long as the expedition lasted, the title of Amyr Almuminyn "Leader of the Faithful" which was subsequently assumed by the Khalifs. He did not communicate to him the plan of the expedition, but gave him sealed orders with

\* Ibn Sa'd p. 99 and *Wákidy apud Tábery*. Ibn Ishák says that there were only eight men, and he gives their names, viz. :

1. Abú Hodzayfah [Mohashshim or Háshim or Hoshaym or Kays] b. 'Otbah b. Raby'ah b. 'Abd Shams. 2. 'Okkáshah b. Mihsan b. Horthán, an ally of the banú Asad b. Khozaymah. 3. 'Otbah b. Ghazwán b. Jábir, an ally of the family of Nawfal b. 'Abd Manáf. 4. Sa'd b. Aby Wakkás of the Zohrah family. 5. 'Ámir b. Raby'ah of the 'Anz b. Wáyil tribe (i. e. an Anezah) and an ally of the family of 'Ady b. Ka'b. 6. Wákíd b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Manáf b. 'Aryn b. Tha'labah b. Yarbú' of the Tamym tribe, an ally of the 'Ady family and more especially of 'Omar. 7. Khálid b. al-Bokayr of the banú Sa'd b. Layth equally an ally of the 'Ady family. 8. Sohayl b. Baydhá or according to others his brother Safwán b. Baydhá of the banú al-Háarith b. Fihir. From Ibn Sa'd we also glean the name of al-Midád b. 'Amr who seized al-Hakam b. Kaysán and made him a prisoner. And Sodyy *apud Tábery* p. 238 mentions also 'Ammár b. Yásir and 'Ámir b. Fohayrah. This name however, may be a mistake for 'Ámir b. Raby'ah. In Ibn 'Okbah *apud* Ibn Sayyid alnás is 'Ámir b. Ayás.

† "The prophet dispatched a small party of men under the command of Abú 'Obaydah b. al-Jarráh. When Abú 'Obaydah took leave, his affection to the prophet overcame him and he shed tears. Mohammad therefore, appointed another person whose name is 'Abd Allah b. Jaʿsh Azdy" (*Mo'tamir apud Tábery*, p. 240). *Wákidy*, p. 7, relates the same story, but he says that the name of the person to whom the command had been offered, was 'Obaydah b. al-Háarith b. al-Mottalib.

directions to open them, after he had proceeded two days journey on the upper Makkah road, on which, the Moslims had several times waylaid the Korayshites. He also told him that when he had read the orders to the men under his command, he was to make them distinctly understand that every one of them was at liberty to proceed and assist him in carrying them out or to return to Madynah. On opening the letter 'Abd Allah found orders to proceed to Nakhlah, which lies on the road from Makkah to al-Táyif and Yáman, and to watch the movements of the Korayshites in that quarter.\*

'Abd Allah declared that he would obey the orders of the prophet and ten of his men were of the same mind, but two went to Baḥrání† and after a considerable stay there they returned to Madynah, where they arrived after their victorious companions.‡

\* According to Ibn Isḥák they were conceived in the following terms: "When you have read this my letter proceed as far as Nakhlah, between Makkah and al-Táyif, watch the movements of the Korayshites and give me information thereof." In *Wákidy* p. 8 the letter runs: "Go to Nakhlah in the name of God and with his blessing. Do not force any one of the men to accompany you but proceed and carry out my orders with those who choose to follow you. When arrived at Nakhlah, watch the caravans of the Korayshites." Another version is in Baghawý Comm. Kor. 2, 214. I do not consider any of these versions as genuine.

According to Sodyy he was to open the orders at Malal which is on the road from Madynah to Makkah, twenty-one or eighteen miles from the former city.

† Baḥrání or Boḥrání is in the neighbourhood of Ma'dan Bany Solaym (Ibn Sa'd). It is not far from al-For' (*Niháyat al-Jazary*). In the territory of the Solaym tribe (*Wákidy* p. 8.)

‡ Ibn 'Otbah *apud* Ibn Sayyid alnás; *Wákidy* p. 8; Sodyy and Mo'tamir *apud* Tabary pp. 239 and 240. The names of these two men are Sa'd b. Aby Wakkás and 'Otbah b. Ghazwán. Ibn Isḥák and most authors after him, including Ibn Sa'd deny that they refused to proceed. He says: "The whole party proceeded as far as a ma'dan which is above For' and has the name of Baḥrání, there the camel which Sa'd and 'Otbah b. Ghazwán were riding went astray, and whilst they went in search of it, the rest of the party proceeded." It appears from *Wákidy* p. 9, that this story has been preserved by the family of Sa'd b. Aby Wakkás and probably invented by them. The father of *Wákidy*'s teacher had received it from the son of Sa'd b. Aby Wakkás. The isnád in Kremer's edition is defective and ought to run "Wákidy from Abú Bakr b. Isma'yl b. Moḥammad from his father, from 'Ásim b. Sa'd b. Aby Wakkás from his father."

When 'Abd Allah with his ten followers had arrived at Nakhlah\* he observed in the afternoon of the 28th of December, 623, a party of four Korayshite merchants. Their camels were laden with leather, raisins and wine, and they were on their way from al-Táyif to Makkah. They were frightened at the appearance of the stragglers whose sinister purpose must have been pretty clear from their light mode of travelling. To remove suspicion from their minds, one of them, 'Okkáhshah, had his head shaved in order to look like a pilgrim. The stratagem succeeded, the more because the new moon over the western horizon assured the merchants that the sacred month of Rajab had commenced, which was respected by the most abandoned robbers, and in which the traveller might fearlessly go his way. They unloaded their camels and sent them over the plains to browse and sat down to cook their dinner. When they were completely off their guard, Wákid took advantage of the opportunity, shot an arrow into them which killed the leading man among them. They now made a rush upon the remaining three men and made two of them prisoners, but the third being mounted on a swift mare effected his escape, and reached Makkah the next morning.† The followers

\* "Nakhlah is identical with the Bostán Ibn 'Ámir which is near Makkah" (Ibn Sa'd p. 99). "Bostán Ibn 'Ámir is a corruption for Bostán Ma'mar (Ibn Mo'ammár ?)" (Ibn Kotaybah, *Adab al-kátib*). The full name of Mo'ammár from whom the place has its name is Mo'ammár b. 'Obayd Allah b. Mo'ammár b. 'Othmán b. 'Amr b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Tamym b. Morrah b. Ka'b b. Lowayy. Some however, say it has its name from Hadhramy Ibn 'Ámir, and some say from 'Abd Allah b. 'Ámir b. Korayz, so that etymology gives us no clue to its history. Bařalyúsy in his commentary to Ibn Kotaybah maintains that the Bostán Ibn 'Ámir and the Bostán Ibn Mo'ammár are not identical, but he allows that the latter is identical with Bařn Nakhlah [*Yáqút, Mu'jam, voce Bostán*]. The same author (*Yáqút*) says under Nakhlah that two valleys meet at Bostán Ibn 'Ámir, one of which comes from Karn almanázil and is called Nakhlah Yamanyyah i. e. Southern Nakhlah). Along this valley runs the road to Yaman. The other comes from al-Komayr and is called Nakhlah Shámyyah or Northern Nakhlah. It is important to observe that these two valleys belong to the Hodzayl tribe, and are two days journey from Makkah. Bostán 'Ámir is situated in Bařn Marr and Sabúrah.

† The name of the man who was killed is 'Amr b. al-Hadhramy ['Abd Allah] b. 'Abbád ('Imád or 'Ayyádz) of the Kindah tribe. He had three brothers, one of them al-'Alá turned a Moslim. He had also a sister, Sa'bah who embraced





of the prophet took the prisoners and goods and returned with them victoriously to Madynah.

There occur two verses in the *Korân* which, according to the testimony of most authorities, bear on this expedition. They run:

"They ask you regarding the sacred month [of Rajab], as concerns fighting in it. Answer: Fighting in it is a serious matter, but to obstruct the path (the religion) of God, to disbelieve in Him and his sacred temple (the Ka'bah) and to expel its votaries (the Moslems) from it, is a much more serious matter in the sight of God. Farther, persecution is a more serious matter than killing a man. They will never cease to make war against you, O Moslems, until they turn you from your religion, if they be able; but the works of those among you who apostate from their religion and die as infidels, shall be vain in this world and in the next, and their reward shall be the fire in which they remain for all eternity."

"Certainly those who believed and those who emigrated and fought in the path of God, may hope for the mercy of God, for God is forgiving and merciful."—(2, 214 and 215).

Mohammad admits without reserve that his disciples have violated the sacred month. His biographers do not exactly deny the fact, but they give explanations which afford interesting specimens of the manner in which they disguise facts discreditable to the Islâm.\*

the Islâm and is the mother of Talhah b. 'Obayd Allah. The men whom they took prisoners are: 'Othmán b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Moghyrah Makhzúmy he was also captured at Badr and died an idolater; and al-Hakam b. Kaysán a barber by profession. The man who escaped is Nawfal b. 'Abd Allah, a brother of 'Othmán.

\* To understand what I have to say in this note, it is necessary to know that the following is the order of the Arabic months: Jumádà II. Rajab, Sha'bán. Of these three, only the Rajab is sacred. It is farther to be observed that the month begins about sunset from the moment the new moon is observed, or might be observed if it was not hidden in clouds. Ibn Is'hák says, "This being the last day of Rajab, they consulted among themselves whether to attack them or not. Some of them observed, If you do not attack them to-night they will slip into the sacred territory where it is unlawful to attack them. On the other hand if you attack them you violate the sacred month. They were long doubtful what to do, but at last they took courage and attacked them." If this version was true, the question would be, did the attack take place before or after sunset. From what he says lower down, it would appear that it took place after sunset, for he states that the Moslems at

The refusal of three of his stoutest adherents—'Obaydah, Sa'd b. Aby *Wakkás* and 'Otbah—to take part in the sacrilege, leads us to infer that it was committed by his orders.\* This however, he Makkah maintained that the robbery was committed in Sha'bán—*Wákidy* states that the attack took place on the last day of *Júmadà*, and most original authorities as *Soddy*, *Mo'tamir*, &c. agree with him on this point though he contradicts himself in p. 2. In page 8 we read, 'The party said to the prophet, we attacked them at day time, in the evening we observed the new moon of *Rajab*. We therefore do not exactly know whether we attacked them in *Rajab* or on the last day of *Jamádà*.' *Ibn Sa'd* says simply, "They were not certain what date it was: and whether it was a day of the sacred month or not." *Baghawy*, in his zeal for the honor of the *Islám* has been betrayed into a strange mistake. He says that they made the attack on the last day of *Júmadà II*. because they did not like to postpone till the next day, for fear they might slip into the sacred territory.

\* In the *Moçannaf Ibn Aby Shaybah*, folio 346, occurs an important tradition which proves that *Moçammad* did not scruple even the preceding year to violate the sacred month "when the prophet had come to *Madynah* the *Johaynah* paid him a visit and said you have settled in our rear, let us conclude a treaty that we may have nothing to fear from you nor you from us. He concluded the treaty with them though they did not embrace the *Islám*. In [the sacred month of] *Rajab*, January, 623, the prophet sent us (the man who speaks is *Sa'd b. Aby Waqqáç*) on a predatory expedition against a tribe of the *Banú Kinánah* [who were in league with the *Qorayshites*] in the neighbourhood of the *Johaynah*. We attacked them, but we were less than one hundred men strong whereas they were very numerous. We therefore, retreated to the *Johaynah*. They said, we hope you did not fight in the sacred month. We answered we fight those in the sacred month who have expelled us from the sacred territory. Upon this [the objections of the *Johaynah* to protect persons who violated the sacred month] a discussion took place among us, some said, let us go to the prophet to inform him of what has happened. Others insisted upon remaining and I [says *Ibn Aby Waqqáç*] and some others proposed to attack a *Korayshite* caravan which was expected. We told them at the same time that if we made any booty only those would have a share in it who would take part in our expedition. We went to waylay the caravan whilst the others returned to the prophet to consult him regarding the sacredness of *Rajab*. When they came to him he was in a great rage and said, "You left me all united and you return to me divided into parties. Division and party-spirit has hitherto ruined the *Arabs*. I will now send a man who shall command you. He surpasses all others in perseverance, and in bearing hunger and thirst. Upon this he appointed 'Abd Allah b. *Ja'šh* as our chief, and he was the first *Amyr* in the *Islám*." I may add that *Majady* the *Shaykh* of the *Johaynah* did not allow them to attack the caravan. This indignation of the *Johaynah* explains why *Moçammad*

denied. When they came to Madynah, he said to them, I did not order you to fight in the sacred month, and he refused to accept the portion of the booty which 'Abd Allah had set aside for him, nor would he divide the booty and dispose of the prisoners. His orders were probably worded in such a manner, that complicity could not be distinctly proved against him. To share responsibility with a man in power is always dangerous. In case of failure he makes his tool the scape-goat.

Those men who professed to restore the religion of the Ka'bah to its purity, and who pretended to live for a higher object had violated one of the most sacred institutions. They had shed blood in one of the four months during which the Arabs sheathed their swords, and during which the merchant and traveller might without fear or molestation travel through the desert. Sohayly, vol. 3, f. 68, observes anent the sacred months.

"The observance of the sacred months was a commandment of God which had been acted up to ever since the time of Abraham and Ishmael. It was one of the prohibitions which God ordained to promote the interests of the inhabitants of Makkah. He says in the Korân 5, 98. 'God has established the Ka'bah, that it be a stand-by for mankind [where they find safety and as a centre of the observances of the true religion]. With the same view he has ordained the holy months, sacrifices and offerings.' This is due to the prayer of Abraham who, when he caused some of his offspring to settle in an unfruitful valley, prayed to God that he might make the hearts of some men affected with kindness towards them. (Kor. 14, 40). The commandment of God, that all men should perform the pilgrimage to Makkah, greatly promotes the interests of its inhabitants and furnishes them with a livelihood. Besides establishing the Ka'bah, God ordained the four holy months. Three of them Dzu-l-ka'dah, Dzu-l-hajj and Mo'harrah are continuous and one of them the Rajab is isolated. The object of the three continuous

was so cautious in planning his expedition the next year : It started before the sacred month but could not reach its destination before new moon and from the equivocations of a written order, no reference could be made to him. It farther explains why the same Ibn Aby Waqqâç who had witnessed this indignation of the Johaynah tribe remained behind, and why 'Abd Allah b. Ja'zsh was chosen as the leader.



months is to enable people to perform the annual general pilgrimage. One month precedes the month in which the pilgrimage is to be performed and one month follows it. The space of three months enables a man to come from the most distant parts of Arabia in safety and return again to his home. The object of rendering the month of Rajab sacred was to enable people to perform occasional individual visits to the Ka'bah. Half a month for going and half a month for returning was enough, for no one comes from a great distance for *this* ceremony. During the pilgrimage, Makkah was provided with supplies which were cut off during the remainder of the year by the Bedouins and robbers. In Rajab the traveller to and from Makkah was equally safe. God had ordered that it should be so in his care and foresight for the Makkians, and he caused this institution of the religion of Abraham to survive. It was not abolished until the Islám was introduced, and it was even kept up in the commencement of the Islám. But the revelation of the 'verse of the sword' made fighting lawful, yet it did not do away entirely with the sacredness of the holy months."

The popular feeling against the outrage was very strong, not only among the pagans, but also among the Moslems who were very harsh against the perpetrators,\* and as it would appear from the above Korán verses some of whom threaten to relinquish the new faith.

Mohammad had himself been present at a war in which all the Homs tribes united to punish a much slighter violation of the ancient Haramite institutions. And therefore, being as yet weak he did not dare formally to abolish the sacred months though he took this step subsequently when he was stronger.† In the above quotation from the Korán he allows that this act of aggression was sinful but holds out a hope to the perpetrators of forgiveness‡ and

\* Ibn Ishák.

† The Jews predicted that this murder would lead to a long war in a bun which they made on the names of 'Amr b. al-Hydhramy and his murderer Wákid. It runs '*amirat alharb*' "the war will last long;" '*hadharat alharb*' "the war has commenced" '*wakadat alharb*' "the war is flaming."

‡ Ibn Ishák who follows the authority of Zohry and of Ibn Rúmán from 'Orwah takes great pains to give a different bearing to the second verse. "After the first

he contents himself by showing to the world that the wrongs which the Korayshites committed against him were much greater than those which he committed against them, and that they had taken the initiative, for it was their display of brute force during the sacred months which prevented him from visiting the Ka'bah agreeably to the Haramite institutions. And in order to put them entirely in the wrong he accused them of disbelief in the primitive religion of the holy temple for which he professed the highest veneration. And he now ordered the Moslems who had hitherto been in the habit of turning their faces in prayers towards Jerusalem like the Jews, to direct their prayers towards the Ka'bah.\* In order fully to appease the popular feeling he was obliged to pay the price of the blood of Ibn al-Hadhramy.† As to the manner in which he disposed of the booty and prisoners, there is a great variety of

verse had been revealed which absolved 'Abd Allah b. Ja'ash from guilt, they came to the prophet and said, that they would now expect some reward from God for their exploit, and upon this, the second verse was resolved, which, he conceived contains a promise of farther reward."

\* According to Ibn Is'hák the qiblah was altered in Sha'bán (February, 624) and consequently just when this affair was in agitation.

† "The prophet paid the price of the blood of Ibn al-Hadhramy to his Korayshite heirs. Mojáhid and others say, he paid it, because there existed a truce of two years between the prophet and the Korayshites." (Baghawý Comm. on the Korán, 2, 214).

"The prophet paid the price of blood for 'Amr b. al-Hadhramy, and he proclaimed that the sacred month is to be respected as it had been. It was subsequently that God made it lawful to fight in it." (Wákidy p. 10, from Ma'mar, from Zohry, from Orwah) but in page 11 is another tradition from Ibn Aby Sabrah in which Ibn 'abbás declares that the prophet did not pay the price of the blood, and Wákidy adds that he and his contemporaries considered this as the true version. I adhere to the view first expressed, because the authority of Zohry is stronger than that of Ibn 'Aby Sabrah, secondly, Ibn 'abbás was a liar, thirdly, as it places the prophet into an unfavorable light, if he had to pay the price of blood (by doing so, he acknowledged that his followers were murderers), it is more likely that the fact, if it happened, would be denied than that such a statement, if not true, was invented. Fifthly, Mojáhid who is one of those men who, during the first century of the Hijrah put the Islám into shape, admits that he paid the price of blood but states a reason which we know to be a lie, because not a month was allowed to elapse during the two years in which the Moslems did not waylay the Korayshites.

opinions. One author, but as far as I know only one,\* states that the booty was returned to its owner, this I conceive to be true because it is consistent with the payment of the blood-money, I also think that the prisoners received their liberty without payment.†

This daring robbery proved to the *Korayshites* that their caravans

\* "Ibn Wahb mentions that the prophet returned the booty and paid the price of the blood of the man who was killed." (*Núr alnibrás* p. 719.) The other statements contradict each other. They run :

"During the time of paganism, it was usual that the leader of a successful expedition received one-fourth of the booty. When 'Abd Allah b. Jaʿsh returned from Nakhlah he took only one-fifth of the booty and divided the rest among his men. This was the first case in the Islám that a leader took a fifth, subsequently the verse of the *Korân* 1, 42 was revealed," (*Wákidy* p. 10). "Some descendants of 'Abd Allah b. Jaʿsh say that he divided the booty when it had been declared lawful. Four-fifths he gave to his men and one-fifth to God and his Messenger. What he did coincided precisely with what God subsequently commanded to be done" (Ibn *Isḥák*, he allows at least that for some time *Moḥammad* did not consider the booty as lawful). Ibn Sa'd says 'Abd Allah divided the booty on his arrival at Madynah without hesitation. And Ibn Sayyid alnás states that some authorities maintain that *Moḥammad* divided the booty after the battle of Badr.

† Though Ibn *Isḥák* states that they were ransomed, he admits that the prophet did not consider their detention before the *Korân* verses quoted above were revealed for, until then, he would have nothing to say to the whole matter. He says: "When the verses of the *Korân* were revealed the prophet took the booty and prisoners under his care. The *Korayshites* sent men to Madynah to ransom the two prisoners. The prophet said to them, I will not give them up before my two men Sa'd and 'Otbah have made their appearance. I fear you have killed them. If so, I put your two men to death. When Sa'd and 'Otbah had come back he accepted the ransom for them. *Al-Hakam* remained with the prophet and he was subsequently slain in the battle of *Byr al-Ma'únah*. 'Othmán returned to Makkah and died there in his former faith." *Wákidy* goes so far as to name even the amount at which they were ransomed, viz.: each of them for forty ounces of gold. One ounce is equal to forty dirhams. The account of Ibn *Isḥák* contains a contradiction. He says that *al-Hakam* was ransomed and also that he then and there embraced the Islám and remained at Madynah. His profession of the Islám would have secured him his liberty without ransom. In the *Isábah* we find the solution of the contradiction. 'Omar intended to put him to death (probably under the impression that Sa'd and 'Otbah had been killed) and to avert his execution he embraced the Islám. The story about the ransom falls therefore to the ground.



were not safe in any place of the *Hijáz*, nor at any season of the year, and henceforth the want of safety, <sup>and</sup> the difficulties and expense of communication were so great that their commerce was ruined. If the object of *Mohammad* in planning this expedition had been to bring matters to a crisis, he obtained it, for two months after the battle of *Badr* was fought, which decided the fate of the ancient institutions of *Makkah*. One of the greatest advantages which *Mohammad* had over his enemies, and one of the main causes of his success was, that he was perfectly free from the fetters which ancient habits imposed upon them. He could break through any law, through any custom, through any preconceived notion of honor, alleging a divine command to counterbalance public opinion. It is true in this instance he gave way but when he grew stronger he neither sacrificed an advantage nor a passion to public opinion. If necessary he justified his acts by a revelation.







D

Ge 11670 (1/2)

sb

ULB Halle 3/1  
001 171 739



