

**Edward P. Zychowicz-Coghill
Worcester College, University of Oxford**

**Conquests of Egypt:
Making history in ‘Abbāsid Egypt**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History
Trinity Term 2017
Word count: 99,996**

for Kev,

who knew

Short abstract: Conquests of Egypt: Making history in ‘Abbāsīd Egypt

Edward P. Zychowicz-Coghill, Worcester College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History, Trinity Term, 2017

This dissertation is a study of the *Futūḥ Miṣr* (*Conquest of Egypt*) of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871), the earliest extant Arabic history of Egypt. Its primary aim is not to assess whether its information is ‘authentic’ – i.e. corresponding to an objective historical reality – though my findings are of relevance for those engaged in debates over authenticity. My goal instead is to explore the ideas about the past which are conveyed by this particular conglomeration of historical information and to propose methods through which we can expose and analyse different layers and types of authorial activity within a multi-vocal text like *Futūḥ Miṣr*. Ultimately, I use this analysis as the basis of a case study suggesting how we might more effectively historicise the generation and transmission of historical ideas in the early Islamic period.

Part I of the thesis consists of three chapters which explore *Futūḥ Miṣr* as a whole, literary text which can be understood as an instantiation of the historical worldview of its composer. Part II of the thesis contains three chapters which each illuminate features of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical practice which are important prerequisites for the stratigraphic reading of *Futūḥ Miṣr* performed in Part III. Part III of the thesis uses the understanding of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial techniques developed in Part II to expose the earlier packages of historical information which underpin *Futūḥ Miṣr*. These final three chapters demonstrate how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam reinvested these pre-existing narratives with meaning at a micro-level – by interjecting commentary and accounts from other sources – and at a macro-level – by integrating them into the larger narrative structure of *Futūḥ Miṣr*.

In sum, this thesis is the first systematic study of the sources, structure, and authorship of an early Arabic history, which both tests and expands our current understanding of the dynamics of early Islamic historical writing, and sheds light on numerous aspects of the changing uses of the past among the Muslim scholars of Umayyad and ‘Abbāsīd Egypt.

Long abstract: Conquests of Egypt: Making history in ‘Abbāsīd Egypt

Edward P. Zychowicz-Coghill, Worcester College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History

Trinity Term, 2017

This dissertation is a study of the *Futūḥ Miṣr* (*Conquest of Egypt*) of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871), the earliest extant Arabic history of Egypt. Its primary aim is not to assess whether its information is ‘authentic’ – i.e. corresponding to an objective historical reality – though its findings are of relevance for those engaged in debates over authenticity. Its goal instead is to explore the ideas about the past which are conveyed by this particular conglomeration of historical information and to propose methods through which we can expose and analyse different layers and types of authorial activity within a multi-vocal text like *Futūḥ Miṣr*. Ultimately, I use this analysis as the basis of a case study suggesting how we might more effectively historicise the generation and transmission of historical ideas in the early Islamic period.

Part I of the thesis consists of three chapters which explore *Futūḥ Miṣr* as a whole, literary text which can be understood as an instantiation of the historical world-view of its composer. Chapter One presents a brief history of Islamic Egypt up to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time followed by a biography of him and his family, focussing on the upheavals they experienced in the third/ninth century. It proposes that *Futūḥ Miṣr*’s celebration of two early Muslim generals whose ancestors had recently led an armed insurrection against the re-imposition of ‘Abbāsīd

control in Egypt would not have been neutral data, and shows how recognising this helps us to locate Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s perspective on these changes. Chapter Two focusses on how *Futūḥ Miṣr* is structured to draw attention to the historic links between the Arabs and the Copts, and how *Futūḥ Miṣr* uses the label ‘Copt’ to construct an autochthonous Egyptian population whose failure to recognise prophetic invitations – in both ‘biblical’ time and the era of the Arab conquests – justifies their subjection to an Arab Muslim regime, even as it carves out a protected place for them within Egypt. Chapter Three examines how the pre-Islamic history which prefaces *Futūḥ Miṣr*’s story of the Arab conquest of Egypt is used to present that act as the next step of a progression of sacred history, an enactment of a repeating paradigm of divine intervention in Egypt.

Part II of the thesis, sub-titled ‘Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical method’, contains three chapters which each illuminate features of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical practice which are important prerequisites for the stratigraphic reading of *Futūḥ Miṣr* performed in Part III. Chapter Four examines in detail Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s quotations of Ibn Hishām’s recension of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*, the one extant source which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam cites on multiple occasions. It demonstrates how strict his reproduction of his source texts was, and the limited ways in which he was willing to recast it through paraphrase, partial quotation, and breaking up continuous texts into multiple *khābars*. More importantly, this chapter allows us to observe Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam relocating these excerpts from the *Sīra* into new – and newly meaning-endowing – narrative contexts, transforming their implications to suit his purposes. Chapter

Five performs a limited *isnād-cum-matn* analysis on a set of *ḥadīths* found in *Futūḥ Miṣr* which had also been taught to Ibn Ishāq by the Egyptian Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb in Alexandria in 737. The close correspondence between these *ḥadīths* as found in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal's *Musnad*, with purely Iraqi lines of transmission back to Ibn Ishāq and Yazīd, and *Futūḥ Miṣr*, with purely Egyptian lines of transmission back to Yazīd, is used to argue that both texts are good independent witnesses to Yazīd's teaching before his death in 128/745-6. This makes it plausible that *Futūḥ Miṣr*'s *isnāds* are a reliable guide to the original content and transmission-history of the texts they accompany as far back to the first half of the second/eighth century. This is important because this is the period from which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam claims that his main narrative historical accounts originate. Chapter Six shows how Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam explicitly signals when he was repeatedly returning to an earlier extended account which formed the backbone of his narrative. While he often refers to these 'backbone' accounts in abbreviated terms, I demonstrate that he provides a full *riwāya-isnād* when he began to use such a backbone source. These *riwāya-isnāds* allow us to identify the origins and transmission-history of the narrative accounts which were the framework around which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam built *Futūḥ Miṣr*.

Part III of the thesis is a stratigraphic reading of *Futūḥ Miṣr*, enabled by Part II, showing the different authorial techniques which we can observe Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam using when writing different sections of his work. Chapter Seven demonstrates how he built his pre-Islamic history around a pre-existing king-list of ancient rulers, which only briefly mentioned the

activity of the ancient prophets in Egypt, and how he supplemented this list with a body of stories-of-prophets (*qışaş al-anbiyāʿ*) which had originated outside Egypt, while also adding introductory and concluding sections drawn from different sources. Chapter Eight shows that all of the narrative-historical sections of *Futūḥ Miṣr* were built around four pre-existing accounts and explores the different concerns of each of these accounts, their authors, and how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam combined them and reshaped them by weaving other reports into their narratives and adding prefatory and concluding sections. The chapter concludes by turning to the larger arrangement of *Futūḥ Miṣr*. It argues that the common transmission history of three of its main conquest-accounts suggests that they had been combined and transmitted together two generations before Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was writing, and that his macro-arrangement was in part simply a more ambitious continuation of an earlier tradition of *futūḥ*-writing in Egypt. Finally, Chapter Nine examines the sections of *Futūḥ Miṣr* which had not been part of this package of *futūḥ* - on the urban history of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, the Islamic judges of Egypt, and the *ḥadīths* transmitted with purely Egyptian *isnāds* - asking how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was recasting this Egyptian tradition of conquest-history by composing these new sections and adding them to it. In sum, this thesis is the first systematic study of the sources, structure, and authorship of an early Arabic history, which both tests and expands our current understanding of the dynamics of early Islamic historical writing, and sheds light on numerous aspects of the changing uses of the past among the Muslim scholars of Umayyad and ʿAbbāsīd Egypt.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part I : Survey: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and the worldview of <i>Futūḥ Miṣr</i>	29
1. The ‘Abbāsid context of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s <i>Conquest</i>	30
2. Defining the Copts in the <i>Conquest of Egypt</i>	53
3. Roles and functions of pre-Islamic history	79
Part II : Sondage: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical method	108
4. Quoting Ibn Hishām’s <i>Sīra</i> : Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s use of his direct sources	112
5. Alexandria, 733: The Umayyad origins of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s information	159
6. Three conquests of Babylon: Identifying ‘backbone’ accounts in <i>Futūḥ Miṣr</i>	178
Part III : Stratigraphy: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s method in practice	200
7. Of king-lists and <i>qiṣaṣ</i> : Excavating <i>Futūḥ Miṣr</i> ’s pre-Islamic history	202
8. Writing conquest history	260
9. Recasting the conquests: Old and new in <i>Futūḥ Miṣr</i>	323
Conclusion	346
Bibliography	351
Index of <i>isnāds</i>	354

Abbreviations and conventions

Primary Sources

- AM – al-Suyūṭī, *Asmā' al-mudallisīn* (Beirut, 1992)
- AQ – Wakī^c, *Akhbār al-Quḍāt* (Cairo, 1947-50)
- BWA – Muḥammad b. Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, *Barnāmaj* (Beirut, 1980)
- FB – al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-buldān* (Beirut, 1988)
- FIA – Ibn 'Aṭīyya, *Fahrasat Ibn 'Atiyya* (Beirut, 1983)
- FIH – Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Mu'jam al-mufahras aw tajrīd asānīd al-kutub al-mashhūra wa-l-ajzā' al-manshūra* (Beirut, 1998)
- FIK – Ibn Khayr, *Fahrassa* (Beirut, 1998).
- FIN – Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (Beirut, 1997)
- FIND – Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, tr. Bayard Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: a tenth-century survey of Muslim culture* (New York, 1970).
- FM – Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr*, ed. C. Torrey, *The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain* (New Haven, 1922).
- HI – Abū Naḍr al-Kalābādhi, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan, *al-Hidāya wa-l-irshād fī ma'rifat al-thiqa al-sadād* (Beirut, 1407 AH)
- HM – al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-muḥāḍara fī ta'rīkh Miṣr* (Miṣr, 1967)
- HP – *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, ed. and tr. O. Burmester, B. Evetts, A. Khater, A. Atiya (Paris, 1904-)
- IH – Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-Nabawīya*, (Cairo, 1955)
- ITK – Mughulṭāy, *Ikmāl tahdhīb al-kamāl* (Cairo, 2001)
- ITS – Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba* (Beirut, 1415 AH)
- IY – Yūnus, *Ta'rīkh al-Miṣriyyīn* (Beirut, 2000)
- JT – Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-'Alā'ī, *Jāmi' al-taḥṣīl* (Beirut, 1986).
- KM – al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz wa-l-i'tibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-l-āthār* (Beirut, 1418 AH)
- KWQ – al-Kindī, *Kitāb al-wulāt wa-kitāb al-quḍāt*, ed. R. Guest, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt* (Leiden, 1912).
- KZ – Ḥajjī Khalifa, *Kashf al-ẓunūn 'an asāmi al-kutub wa al-funūn* (Baghdad, 1941).
- LM – Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān al-Mīzān* (Beirut, 1971).
- MA – Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūṭ (Beirut, 2001)
- MB – Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Mu'jam al-buldān* (Beirut, 1995)
- MI – al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-'itidāl* (Beirut, 1963).
- MS – al-Baghawī, *Mu'jam al-ṣaḥāba* (Kuwait, 2000)
- MUA – Ibn Hibbān, Muḥammad, Abū Ḥātim, *Mashāhīr 'ulamā' al-amṣār* (al-Manṣūra, 1991)
- MT – al-Fasawī, *al-Ma'rifa wa-l-ta'rīkh* (Beirut, 1981).
- MW – al-Wāqidī, *al-Maghāzī* (Beirut, 1989)
- NJ – Sa'īd b. Batriq, *Naẓm al-Jawhar*, ed. M. Breydy, *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien : ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Sa'īd ibn Batriq um 935 A.D.* (Louvain, 1985)
- SAN – al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* (Beirut, 1985)

- SU – Ibn b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Muḥammad, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, *Sīrat ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz* (Beirut, 1984)
- TAB – al-Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-Awsaṭ* (Cairo, 1977)
- TB – al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* (Beirut, 2002)
- TD – Ibn ‘Asākir, *Taʾrīkh Dimashq* (Amman, 1995)
- TI – al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh al-islām* (Beirut, 2003)
- TIS – Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh, *Taʾrīkh Iṣbahān* (Beirut, 1990)
- TK – Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* (Beirut, 1990)
- TKh – Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, *Taʾrīkh* (Beirut, 1397 AH)
- TKAR – al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā’ al-rijāl* (Beirut, 1980)
- TKB – al-Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-Kabīr* (Hyderabad, no date)
- TM – al-Nasāʾī, Aḥmad b. Shu‘ayb, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, *Tasmiyat mashāyikh al-Nasāʾī* (Mecca, 1423 AH)
- TS – al-Sūdūnī, Qāsim b. Qutlūbaghā, *al-Thiqāt mimman lam yaqī‘ fī -l-kutub al-sitta* (Ṣan‘ā’, 2011)
- TT – al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk* (Beirut, 1387 AH)

Torrey and Guest’s editions of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and al-Kindī both contain two separate paginations, one in English for their introductions, one in Arabic for the edited text. When I cite their introductions I do not use the abbreviations listed above. Therefore, C. Torrey, *The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain known as the Futūḥ Miṣr of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam* (New Haven, 1922), p.21, refers to page twenty-one of Torrey’s introduction. FM 21 refers to page twenty-one of the edited Arabic text.

Secondary Source Abbreviations

- AZ – al-Ziriklī, *al-A‘lām* (15th edition, 2015).
- EI2 – *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition online (2012).
- EQ – J. McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān*, online edition (2001-6).

Dating

Dates are generally expressed using both the Hijrī and Common eras. The Hijrī date is expressed first, followed by a slash and the CE date. Therefore, the date of the author’s death

is expressed as 257/871. Regarding Arabic editions of texts, when a CE date is given for the edition, I provide that in the apparatus. If there is only a Hījrī date I give that.

Translation and transliteration

All translation of primary sources is my own except when I reference a translation in a footnote. When the pious invocations *ṣallā -llāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallam* and *raḍīya -llāhu ‘anhu* occur I write either capital Ṣ or R in both translation and transcription.

In transliteration I generally include *īrāb* when reproducing full sentences, but exclude it when I provide the transliterated Arabic wording for a key term or phrase. Names are transliterated in capitals using *b.* to indicate ‘Ibn’ and without *īrāb*, though are declined when case is nonetheless visible, e.g. *ḥaddathanāhu ‘an Abī Ṣāliḥ*. Well-known place names in English are expressed with their common English spelling, e.g. Cairo for al-Qāhira. Less well-known places are transliterated but without italics when written as part of an English sentence, e.g. ‘he returned to al-Fuṣṭāṭ’. I retain the Arabic definite article in those proper nouns which have them in Arabic, e.g. ‘al-Layth b. Sa‘d’ rather than ‘Layth b. Sa‘d’.

Acknowledgements

Many people go into the making of a book, and more into the making of a person. It is hard to express how much I have owed to so many: the teachers who guided me, the friends who made the journey worthwhile, and my parents, without whom none of this could have been.

A *tarjama* should include a full list of *shuyūkh*. I have tried to remember some of those who have taught me or given advice which changed my course. At Startforth primary school, June Armstrong transformed my prospects. At Teesdale comprehensive, Cassie Flint honed and encouraged a joy in closely reading texts – among much else – without which I would never have got to Oxford. Later Simon Henderson and Claire Ellis talked me into studying history and managed to convince me to apply for a history degree.

At St Hugh's college, George Garnett and John Robertson drove me to take history seriously and dispatched me beyond the college to enjoy the instruction of Peter Heather, Ian Archer, Alexandra Gajda, Susan Brigden, John Nightingale, Bryan Ward-Perkins, and Clive Holmes. James Howard-Johnston planted a seed of fascination in the eastern Mediterranean world after Rome, enchanted with his tutorial patter, and sought the Zychowicz-Coghill perspective so insistently that ZC had to bother to formulate it. He read, corrected, and attempted to re-order every piece of academic work I wrote as a graduate and it was better for it.

In Syria and Egypt, Sami El Bak and Heba Mussad drilled me through the basics of modern standard Arabic. Back in Oxford Nadia Jamil, *dhāt hayba*, taught me to read and enjoy classical Arabic texts. Lukas Schachner gave me some archaeological literacy and Nicola Clarke taught me my first series of tutorials on Islamic history. At some point, both she and Phil Booth independently suggested that I might work on Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's *Futūḥ Miṣr* for my master's dissertation... Harry Munt was also on hand to cast some light into the dim world of Islamic history which I was entering. Mary Whitby taught me classical Greek, a masterclass in what could be achieved in a year, while Ida Toth instructed me in medieval Greek and even a little Latin. Geert van Gelder let me attend some of his Arabic classes.

Above all, Mark Whittow and Robert Hoyland supervised my master's dissertation with patience, trust, and encouragement, a double-act they eventually revived for the DPhil itself. In one way or another they each kept me going at critical moments. Mark, I will always miss.

At the University of Chicago I took courses with Angelika Neuwirth, Muhammad Eissa, John Woods, Robert Gleave, Sulayman Hasan, and Paul Walker. Fred Donner treated me with levels of kindness, generosity and understanding which one would hardly expect from the academy, while Ahmed El Shamsy was inspiring and good-humoured in equal measure. I was truly saddened not to research my PhD with them, and to miss the chance to learn under the many other teachers I did not have time to study with there. In Princeton I benefitted from the instruction of Jack Tannous and András Hámori. Manolis Papoutsakis, that horrible man from New Jersey, taught me Syriac. Michael Cook gave me the best thought-out graduate courses I have experienced and subsequently commented on my research with the same perspicacity and wit with which he conducted his classes. At his Holberg seminar I have had the chance to learn from Antoine Borrut, Khaled El-Rouayheb, Marina Rustow, Theo Beers, Sébastien Garnier, Lidia Gocheva, Matt Keegan, Pamela Klasova, Daisy Livingston, Christian Mauder, Najah Nadi, Eugénie Rébillard, and Naseem Surhio. Collectively, they have been a third supervisor. Back, again, in Oxford, I was fortunate enough to encounter yet more inspiring presences: Julia Bray, Michael Featherstone, Thorsten Oppen, Ine Jacobs, and Ahriman van Lindt to name but a few.

Through this long journey I have been sustained by the company of many *aṣḥāb*, without whom I would never have persisted. It begins with Ash, Eddy, Tiff, and Pete, with whom I have learnt more about how the past changes and is changed, is made and forgotten, than I will in any history book. Happily, they are joined now by my friends Blythe, Julie, Liz, and Cristina. Nor will I forget the good times with Richard Charles Commitment Levett, Tom, Nathan, John and Anna, and Rob and Emma. I learned much with and from my family of trees; Howard, Emily, Cat, Matthew, Laura, Solomon, and Florence, with whom I shared some of the finest years of my life. Toby taught me to climb and Louisa offered shelter under oranges and lemon trees. There were those who swam under a Turkish flag; George, Abdallah, Francesca, Vanessa, Patrick, Aliaa, and Dora. *Bt7ibbu meen?* And there were those

who did not, notably Feras, and the other denizens of Beit Arne; Lizzie, Arne, Dan, Fabio, Stalin, and that French guy. Guillaume and Noura made my first summer in Cairo bearable. My colleagues on the master's degree are too many to mention, but special recognition must go to Alexis, Adrastos, Michael, Kirsty, and Foteini for their hospitality and company in various times and places. Anna climbs with me and keeps me sane in hard times. Mimi was the best neighbour I could have hoped for, in spite of initial appearances. Aleks and I basically passed as ships in the night, but figured it out later. Mathura shared joy and tragedy. In Chicago, Rich and Jenna made me feel like family. Al and Becca kept me in spirits, good and bad, while Josh, Garrett, and Jamal kept me on the *ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm*. Harry threw the finest parties. The less said about gin gimlets the better. Mariam was the best. Everyone else was great too. Nik and Matthew started the last leg of this journey with me and endeavoured in their different ways to make me less vulgar. They failed, but the fault lies not with them. Jordan took me to see the Northern Lights. Emily 'the Dolminator' helped me find refuge at the wall a hundred times over, Pavlína showed me how to climb hard, and Emily C crushed VDiff's with me in our first leads in Wales and the Lake District, thanks to our friends in the OUMC. The summer of fun will never be forgotten, and with it Umberto, Anna, Steffi, Marco, Sophie, Anne, Alberto, and Andrea, and Robyn who came in its wake. The list goes on. Where have Rachel and Olivia been all my life? Shaza and Sofian were the perfect companions for a second summer in Cairo, and I did not steal their Euros. And then there is, Steffi, who swam at Annaba, Tipasa, Oxford, and Berlin. Finally, a new community; Gillian, Duncan, Josh, Elspeth, Ben, Dave, and Sarah. Above all, I would not be where or who I am without my finest companion, the seal of seals, who knows the slon music.

The greatest thanks of all go to my parents, Lusia and Kevin, Geoff and Linden, whom I love and who have each taught me what only they could.

Introduction

This dissertation is a study of the *Futūḥ Miṣr* (*Conquest of Egypt*) of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871), the earliest extant Arabic history of Egypt. My primary goal is not to assess whether its information is ‘authentic’ – i.e. corresponding to an objective historical reality – though my findings are of relevance for those engaged in debates over authenticity. My goal instead is to explore the ideas about the past which are conveyed by this particular conglomeration of historical information and to propose methods through which we can expose and analyse different layers and types of authorial activity within a multi-vocal text like *Futūḥ Miṣr*. Ultimately, I use this analysis as the basis of a case study suggesting how we might more effectively historicise the generation and transmission of historical ideas in the early Islamic period.¹

The Text

Futūḥ Miṣr relates an eclectic history of Egypt from the time of Noah to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s own day, making it a chronologically near-universal work. However, as suggested by its title, the focus is regional. Only events in Egypt are recounted, aside from the Islamic conquests in

¹ For an excellent review of the issues at stake in such an approach, taking into account issues raised by the ‘linguistic turn’, see K. Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography: Authors as Actors* (London, 2006), pp. 1-7. He proposes as a methodological starting point G. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, London, 1997), especially the chapter, ‘History, historicism, and the social logic of the text’, pp. 3-28. My receptiveness to such approaches is in part due to my undergraduate exposure to studies of the historiography of the post-Roman west. See, for example, the essays in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past in the early middle ages* (London, 2000).

the Maghrib (North Africa and Iberia) which were launched from Egypt. The work is divided into seven sections (*juzʿ - aǧzāʿ*). The first, around forty-five pages long, is concerned with the status and merits of the Copts and the pre-Islamic history of Egypt.² I refer to this as the ‘pre-Islamic history’. The second, a similar length, recounts the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs.³ The third, almost fifty pages long, describes the layout of al-Fuṣṭāṭ and relates it to the original settlement after the conquest.⁴ I refer to this section throughout as the ‘*khīṭaṭ*’. The fourth part, around another fifty pages, is a somewhat miscellaneous section which includes information about early administrative arrangements in Egypt including the tax system, some natural features of Egypt, arrangements for supporting the early Muslim armies outside al-Fuṣṭāṭ, and the early westwards expansions from Egypt.⁵ It can probably best be summed up as ‘things about Egypt which relate to ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ and/or ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb’, whose relationship is a theme throughout.⁶ The fifth, thirty-three pages long, takes as its topic the conquest-campaigns and governance of North Africa and Iberia, and will be referred to as the ‘western-conquests’ section.⁷ The sixth section, at around twenty pages, recounts the history of the Islamic judges (*qāḍīs*) of Egypt up to the author’s time, and will be referred to as the ‘history of the judges’.⁸ The last and longest section of the book, over seventy pages long, is a collection of mostly prophetic *ḥadīths* (reports of events of the Muḥammad’s life) transmitted on the authority of companions who settled in Egypt, and will be referred to as the ‘*ḥadīth*’

² FM 1-44.

³ FM 45-90.

⁴ FM 91-139.

⁵ FM 139-192

⁶ Some of the westward expansion in the section, however, are conducted under ‘Uthmān.

⁷ FM 192-225.

⁸ FM 226-247.

section.⁹ It is immediately obvious that the work does not fit easily into a single category, including as it does elements of universal, local, conquest, administrative, and institutional history, as well as a considerable body of *ḥadīth* material. It cannot be treated simply as a work of *futūḥ*, whatever we take that to mean, despite the title by which we know it, which may not even have been how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam referred to it.¹⁰ Understanding the logic which resulted in the author combining this diverse body of material as a whole, and its subsequent transmission in that state, will be one of the aims of this dissertation.

Futūḥ Miṣr has long been recognized as being a fundamental text which must play a part in our understanding of the transition between the late antique to early Islamic periods, particularly regarding the conquests of Egypt and the Islamic west, the new administrative arrangements of the caliphate, and the urban history of al-Fuṣṭāṭ. Kubiak, writing on the latter topic, stated that ‘[t]he exceptional value of the *Futuh Misr* is undeniable and needs no apology’.¹¹ In administrative history, *Futūḥ Miṣr* has traditionally been at the heart of reconstructing the original system of caliphal taxation in Egypt.¹² It is now clear that

⁹ FM 248-319.

¹⁰ There is no introduction by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam naming the work. On *futūḥ*-history, much has been written, see C. Robinson, *Empire and elites after the Muslim conquest : the transformation of northern Mesopotamia* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 1-32; A. Noth identified it as one of his ‘salient themes’ in Islamic history-writing in *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: a source-critical study* (Princeton, 1994); F. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: the beginnings of Islamic historical writing* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 174-82; idem, ‘Arabic Faṭḥ as ‘Conquest’ and its Origin in Islamic Tradition’, *al-‘Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā* 24 (2016), pp. 1-14, which contains an up-to-date bibliography including summary encyclopaedia articles by L. Conrad and C. Robinson.

¹¹ W. Kubiak, *al-Fustat: Its foundation and early development* (Cairo, New York, 1987), p. 18.

¹² See for example the discussion of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s evidence in K. Morimoto, *The fiscal administration of Egypt in the early Islamic period* (Kyoto, 1981), pp. 21-23, or in G. Frantz-Murphy,

documentary material tells us far more about reality than the normative ideas about tax and administration found in a text like *Futūḥ Miṣr*, but these normative ideas are still important for understanding how the tax system was envisioned and providing a framework within which to place the fragmentary papyrological evidence.¹³ It is the earliest surviving Arabic work on the conquest of Egypt and the Maghrib, and while my own and other recent work suggests that it is of limited use for reconstructing the events of the conquest, its version of events must still be taken into account and it provides much insight into how those conquests were viewed.¹⁴

Furthermore, whether or not its account of the conquest of Egypt is accurate, its story continued to be told. As Mikhail notes, it ‘enjoyed tremendous success. It is difficult to identify a single Arabic conquest tradition in later sources that is not dependent upon that work’.¹⁵ Most of the legends about Egypt’s past collected by Haarmann from various sources throughout the pre-modern period could already be found in *Futūḥ Miṣr*.¹⁶ Indeed, these

‘Conversion in Early Islamic Egypt: the economic factor’, in R. Hoyland (ed.), *Muslims and Others in Early Islamic Society* (Ashgate, 2004).

¹³ P. Sijpesteijn, *Shaping a Muslim State: The World of a Mid-Eighth Century Official* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 91, 95.

¹⁴ P. Booth, ‘The Muslim Conquest of Egypt Reconsidered’, *Travaux et Mémoires* 17 (2013), pp. 639-70. On Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and the Maghrib, see N. Clarke, *Muslim Conquest*, especially pp. 29-40.

¹⁵ M. Mikhail, *From Byzantine to Islamic Egypt: Religion, identity and politics after the Arab conquest* (New York, 2014), p. 31. Mikhail must, however, be ignoring al-Ṭabarī, who ignored Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s account entirely, despite having met him. There is substantial crossover between al-Balādhurī’s account of Egypt’s conquest and FM’s, though this is due to reliance on common sources rather than al-Balādhurī’s use of FM. After these more contemporaneous authors, however, Mikhail’s comment obtains.

¹⁶ U. Haarmann, ‘Regional Sentiment in Medieval Islamic Egypt’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), pp. 55-66.

stories continue to be told: the names *Futūḥ Miṣr* gives to the Pharaonic rulers of Egypt are still the ones taught to children in Egyptian primary schools.¹⁷ As Kubiak noted, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s section on the history of al-Fuṣṭāṭ ‘served as the model for a whole series of subsequent treatises of this kind’.¹⁸ Likewise, his history of the judges of Egypt is the earliest extant example of its kind, and directly inspired later, more mature works of this type by al-Kindī and Wakī’.¹⁹ *Futūḥ Miṣr* is therefore not only an important source for modern historical investigation of the reality and perceptions of the conquests and early caliphate, but also exerted considerable influence on later Arabic literature which followed in its footsteps.

We might, therefore, expect a substantial body of academic scholarship outlining the text, discussing its sources, how these sources were used by the author, the milieu from which it arose, and the aims and agendas behind its composition. In reality, only two article-length pieces in western languages have been published on the text.²⁰ Robert Bruschvig’s article ‘Ibn

¹⁷ Najah Nadi Ahmad, personal communication, Holberg seminar, Princeton, 2017.

¹⁸ Kubiak, *al-Fustat*, p. 18.

¹⁹ Al-Kindī’s *Kitāb al-quḍāt*, a later history of the judges of Egypt, while apparently avoiding citing Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, re-uses much of his material and stops at exactly the same point, suggesting that it was a reworking of this section of FM. Wakī’’s caliphate-wide history of the judges incorporates Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s section basically verbatim, and re-uses many of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s introductory passages in its own introduction. For references, see my discussion in ch. 9.

²⁰ I discovered an Arabic collection of articles on the text too late to incorporate into this work. See *Dirāsāt ‘an Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam* (Cairo, 1975). It is possible that I have duplicated the effort of some of the scholars who contributed to this volume. Greater attention to Arabic-language scholarship will be a priority in my future research.

Two unpublished doctoral dissertations have previously been written on FM to my knowledge, and while they can be useful for getting a feel for the work, both are hampered by methodological flaws. The first is Y. Hilloowala, ‘The history of the conquest of Egypt, being a partial translation of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s *Futuh Misr* and an analysis of this translation’ (University of Arizona Ph.D. thesis, 1998). Hilloowala’s dissertation is primarily a translation of the sections of the text on the conquest and the settlement of Egypt. Her analysis continually takes for granted the factual content of the work, and is mostly descriptive. Being a partial analysis, she does not take into

Abdelḥakam and the Conquest of North Africa', published in the 1940s, was a pathbreaking study, an early herald of the sceptical revisionist school's objections to the reliability of Arabic conquest-history.²¹ In it, he argues that the events described in *Futūḥ Miṣr*:

are fully explained only through consideration of judicio-religious problems, which are themselves without any doubt, all too often, not so much the outcome of a given historical situation, but the *raison d'être* or the point of departure of this or that account.²²

As the only sustained attempt to provide a key to interpreting *Futūḥ Miṣr*, this analysis has been reproduced in almost all subsequent references to the text. Thus, Kubiak repeats that *Futūḥ Miṣr* was intended merely 'to give a plausible historical explanation for a number of obscure juridico-religious traditions', Hugh Kennedy writes that *Futūḥ Miṣr* 'was collected for legal rather than historical reasons' and Nicola Clarke states that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam 'wrote his history largely for the purposes of illustrating points of *fiqh*'.²³ However, the repetition of Brunschvig's analysis tends to totalise it and reduce it to the 'judicio-religious' point, forgetting that Brunschvig himself pointed to folkloric, even epic themes in the text.²⁴

account the larger structure and aims of the work. The translation contains errors, and is not a suitable basis for academic study. The second is C. Wright, 'Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's *Futuh Misr*: An Analysis of the Text and New Insights into the Islamic Conquest of Egypt' (University of California Santa Barbara Ph.D. thesis, 2006). Wright gestures to the notion that the anecdotal details of the text 'offer a window into Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's world', pp. 10-11, but quickly moves on to a long analysis attempting to argue for the facticity of the treaties contained in FM. Better attempts have been made to argue this, and the thesis adds little to an understanding the text of FM.

²¹ Translated and reprinted in F. Donner(ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008).

²² Ibid, p. 225.

²³ Kubiak, *al-Fustat*, pp. 18-19; H. Kennedy, 'Egypt as a province in the Islamic caliphate, 641-868', in M. Daly(ed.), *The Cambridge History of Egypt* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1998), p. 63. Clarke, *Muslim Conquest*, p. 29. However, Clarke does allow for further motivations of nostalgia for a golden age and arguing for Egyptian financial self-determination, and conducts a useful analysis of the text which shows how folkloric, moralising elements are also part of FM's fabric, pp. 33-5.

²⁴ Brunschvig, 'Ibn Abdelḥakam', pp. 213-7.

Further, his analysis was limited to the North African section of the book, less than ten percent of the whole. Even within the material he analyses, we might question Brunschvig's conclusion that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's inclusion of legally significant anecdotes or terminology meant that his purposes were primarily legal. A striking example is his analysis of *Futūḥ Miṣr*'s foundation-story of Qayrawān, the capital of Ifrīqiya.²⁵ The Muslim general 'Uqba b. Nāfi' stands at the future site of the city, a valley infested with snakes and lions, and cries out three times for them to depart. They miraculously comply and do not return for forty years. Brunschvig shows that the story displays intertextuality with a tradition in Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* in which Muḥammad demonstrates how snakes should be driven out of Medinan houses. However, it is surely wrong to conclude that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam included the story in *Futūḥ Miṣr* to support Mālik's position on Medinan pest-control. Such a historical legend, recounted without a full *isnād*, would have had no legal weight for a *muḥaddith*. Rather, 'Uqba is being painted as a legendary hero who could, like the Pied Piper or St Patrick, command nature. His conformity to Muḥammad's practice in founding the city is an argument that the companions of Muḥammad transplanted his words and practices into the places where they settled, an argument which actually is fundamental to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's agenda, as we shall see in chapter nine. The point of such stories was not simply to document legal exempla. Had Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam wanted to write a work of *fiqh*, he would have been quite capable of doing so. Rather Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam alluded to or employed *ḥadīth* in order to characterise the actors in his narrative and add layers of meaning to their actions. Brunschvig was quite right to

²⁵ Ibid, pp. 213-7. See FM 196.

point to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s legal training as a lens through which we should view his project, but law is not a sufficient explanation for his history.

The second published piece of scholarship directly concerning *Futūḥ Miṣr* is Boaz Shoshan’s chapter on ‘The conquest of Egypt: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and beyond’ in *The Arabic historical tradition and the early Islamic conquests: Folklore, tribal lore, holy war* (London, 2016). However, this short chapter is little more a paraphrase of the accounts of the conquest of Egypt by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, al-Ṭabarī, and psuedo-Wāqidī, accompanied by brief commentary. Shoshan suggests that we contextualise ‘the emergence of a local tradition’ in Egypt in the framework of ‘disappointment with the Egyptian conquest stories as told in Iraq’ and Ṭulūnid independence.²⁶ However, this suggestion of how we might historicise Egyptian history-writing is seriously misleading. Firstly, rather than assuming that all developments occur in the imperial centre and filter out, we should envisage a more dynamic world in which provincial actors asserted and pursued their own interests and agendas, which could sometimes drive changes at more obvious centres.²⁷ Secondly, the specious association of a ‘local’ history with the emergence of a ‘local’ dynasty finds no affirmation in the text of *Futūḥ Miṣr*, or in the biography of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, who died just a couple of years after Ibn Ṭulūn

²⁶ B. Shoshan, *The Arabic historical tradition and the early Islamic conquests: Folklore, tribal lore, holy war* (London, 2016), pp. 155-6.

²⁷ For illustrations of such dynamics with regard to Egypt, see J. Brockopp, ‘The Formation of Islamic Law: The Egyptian School 750-900’, *Annales Islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 123-40; M. Tillier, ‘Les « premiers » cadis de Fustāṭ et les dynamiques régionales de l’innovation judiciaire (750-833)’, *Annales islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 213-242. The suggestion regarding Iraq seems more to do with the fact that Shoshan is comparing Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam with al-Ṭabarī, who operated in Iraq, albeit a generation or so after Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.

arrived in Egypt. *Futūḥ Miṣr*, as we shall see in chapter one, celebrates the ancestors of exactly the traditional Arab aristocracy whom Turks like Ibn Ṭūlūn were displacing. And a brief look at his mosque tells you that Ibn Ṭūlūn had no interest in Egypt's indigenous Islamic history: he did not give a damn about al-Fuṣṭāṭ, he wanted to build Sāmarrāʾ-on-the-Nile. Other problems abound.²⁸ Shoshan suggests that Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and 'Abū Qābil' [sic - Qabīl] are Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's earliest written sources, though how he ascertains the written nature of these sources is not explained in text or footnote.²⁹ It is also not clear how the existence of such sources might argue for the contextualization of an Egyptian local tradition in '[t]he hundred years between 264/868 and 358/969', given that both Yazīd and Abū Qabīl died in the late Umayyad period in 128/745-6.³⁰ And while Abū Qabīl is used as an indirect authority in *Futūḥ Miṣr*, he is only quoted twice in the account of the conquest of Egypt which Shoshan is inspecting, suggesting that he is being referenced here because of his presence in Sezgin's *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* rather than Shoshan's primary source-work with *Futūḥ Miṣr*.³¹

Perhaps it is unfair to pick on the shortcomings of such a work, given that Shoshan had no proper study of *Futūḥ Miṣr* to refer to, and was clearly not trying to conduct such a study

²⁸ Not least the mistranslation and resulting misunderstanding of the Copt's prophesy delivered to 'Amr discussed at Shoshan, *Arabic historical tradition*, p. 158. For this story, see chapter nine.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 156.

³⁰ On Abū Qabīl, see TKAR 7/49-3. On Yazīd, TI, 3/562. The emergence of Egypt as an important political centre after Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's lifetime may indeed be important for understanding FM's successful reception and reproduction, but Shoshan does not make it clear that this is what he is suggesting.

³¹ Abū Qabīl is quoted briefly at FM 74, 82.

himself. However, the abundance of such confusing and misleading suggestions in the scholarly literature on Arabic historiography, made in passing and then picked up and repeated, clearly impedes cumulative progress within the field. Rigorous studies of particular texts are required so that they may subsequently be appropriately used and historicised. Not all references to *Futūḥ Miṣr* in the literature need to be junked. The work of both Hugh Kennedy and Nicola Clarke points us in useful directions. Maged Mikhail has perceptive things to say about the text, though his notion that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam ‘subtly, though brilliantly, promotes [his] historiographic sensibilities’ is perhaps pre-emptive given that no-one has tried in a sustained way to work out what Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historiographic sensibilities actually were.³² The following study is an attempt to do this, and to provide models for how it might effectively be done for other early Arabic historians.

Approaching *Futūḥ Miṣr*

The foundation of my approach to *Futūḥ Miṣr* is an attempt to productively recognise and reconcile two quite obvious features of early Arabic historical composition which sit uneasily within traditional conceptions of authorship, and have thus inhibited progress in the study of the composition of early Arabic historical works. Firstly, most of our extant historical texts present themselves as compilations of quotations, and as such their content cannot simply be ascribed to a single agent. Yet despite this, these extant texts are nonetheless clearly the

³² Mikhail, *Byzantine to Islamic Egypt*, pp. 24.

product of a decisive instance of redaction by a composer who at a particular historical moment arranged these multiple voices into a new whole.³³ This apparent conflict, I suggest, is one of the main reason why the field has not generated studies of single texts which would allow us to use and assess their contents more effectively.³⁴

Many of these texts – including *Futūḥ Miṣr* – are patchworks of micro-narratives (*khabars*) authenticated by chains of citation (*isnāds*). These *isnāds* ascribe each *khabar* to either earlier historical authorities or eyewitnesses to the events in question. The composer of the extant text thus denies his authorship of its content at every turn. Indeed, within the framework of *isnād-khabar* rhetoric, this denial is fundamental to the validation of the account. Therefore, the fact that the fabric of much of our extant histories did not originate with their composers has traditionally been foregrounded in Arabic historiography.³⁵ Authorship proper – in the sense of creation of new text – is deferred to earlier figures whose texts (whether oral or written) are not extant, surviving only partially through later quotation. These earlier figures' authorship of any given *khabar*, however, as well as its original form, is difficult to prove,

³³ While allowing that this new whole did not have the fixed nature of a modern published book.

³⁴ We might contrast the situation in western medieval historiography, where – for example – the last quarter-century has produced six monograph-length works on how we view sixth-century Francia through Gregory of Tours' lens in English alone. A. Breukelaar, *Historiography and episcopal authority in sixth-century Gaul: the Histories of Gregory of Tours interpreted in their historical context* (Göttingen, 1994); I. Wood, *Gregory of Tours* (Bangor, 1994); M. Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours: history and society in the sixth century* (Cambridge, 2001); K. Mitchell and I. Wood (eds.), *The world of Gregory of Tours* (Leiden, 2002); E.T. Dailey, *Queens, consorts, concubines: Gregory of Tours and women of the Merovingian elite* (Leiden, 2015); A. Murray (ed.), *A companion to Gregory of Tours* (Leiden, 2016).

³⁵ This is of course equally the case for much pre-modern historical writing, for example the cut-and-paste approach of medieval chronicles. However, the lack of explicit citation makes this a less visible feature of those texts.

always contestable on the grounds of false ascription or later remoulding, and thus hard to analyse with much rigour. Meanwhile, the composers of our extant texts are reduced to the status of mere compilers, assembling ‘piles of disparate traditions reflecting no one personality, school, time or place’.³⁶ Where authorship existed it cannot be pinned down, and where it might be pinned down – in our extant texts – it did not exist.

This difficulty of locating authorship frustrates both the positivist historian and the historian who professes that historical narratives tell us more about the people and contexts which produced them than the events they purport to describe.³⁷ A fundamental part of the former’s source-critical approach to finding out ‘what really happened’ is identifying and factoring out the shortcomings, agendas, and perspectives of authors of historical narrative. The latter, even if she does not care what actually happened, needs to know who produced a narrative and when in order to stand a chance of drawing informed, non-circular conclusions about the debates which particular (re-)productions of the past were intervening in, and the purposes to which history was being put. It is little wonder that the Arabic historical tradition has produced comments like ‘one can take the picture presented or one can leave it, but one cannot *work* with it’.³⁸

³⁶ P. Crone, *Slaves on horses : the evolution of the Islamic polity* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 10.

³⁷ For which approach see, for example, the essays in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 2000).

³⁸ Crone, *Slaves*, p. 14.

This rather bleak state of aporia has been challenged by historians who argue that the composers of our extant texts did engage in authorial activity, facilitated indirectly by theoretical notions that all text is a 'tissue of quotations'. If the writer's only power is 'to mix writings, to counter ones with the others', early Arabic historians' obsession with quotation is differentiated by degree rather than quality from what is conventionally considered authorship.³⁹ Rather than buying the Arabic historians' rhetoric of denied authorship, some modern historians recognise that the people who composed our extant histories, even if they were entirely reproducing text transmitted to them, could nevertheless exert considerable control over their works by selecting, editing, and arranging their component parts into meaningful configurations.⁴⁰ If we accept that the contrasting uses to which history was being put by particular, situated actors in the third/ninth century is a valid object of study, an underdeveloped field of research opens up.⁴¹ This presents us with the attractive possibility of trying to read historical texts on the surface as full, literary wholes, asking what patterns of historical causation are forwarded in the worlds of different texts, how different sections of a work relate to and convey meaning to each other, which themes are prevalent in given works, and other such issues. To some extent, we may set aside questions of the

³⁹ R. Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in his *Image, music, text* (London, 1977), p. 146.

⁴⁰ This historiographical perspective and its development is well outlined, with references, by Clarke, *Muslim Conquest*, p. 28.

⁴¹ This is a basic proposal, but the lack of studies attempting to systematically analyse and contextualise individual works in this way is notable. A. Shboul, *Al-Mas'ūdī & his world : a Muslim humanist and his interest in non-Muslims* (London, 1979), is a partial exception. Sean Anthony has recently asked 'Was Ibn Wāḍiḥ al-Ya'qūbī a Shi'ite Historian? The State of the Question', *Al-'Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā* 24 (2016), pp. 15-41. While questions regarding the manner and extent of sectarian influence on history are valuable, there are surely further questions to ask of our historians than whether or not they were Shi'ite.

earlier origins of particular historical ideas, because their very inclusion in an ordered, selected narrative indicates their acceptance in the composer's historical worldview.⁴² These ideas can be contextualised in terms of the social, political, and intellectual affiliations and experiences of the author. We may then attempt to analyse their plausible significance within these contexts, asking what their histories meant to the compilers whose selectivity determines our access to the earlier Arabic historical tradition. This approach, treating *Futūḥ Miṣr* as a snapshot of the historical worldview of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam at the moment of its composition, will be taken up in Part I of this dissertation, and will demonstrate that *Futūḥ Miṣr* is arranged to develop particular historical ideas in a coherent and sustained manner, which plausibly address contemporary issues which he and the networks of people around him faced.

However, this new, more generous perspective on the authorial role of Arabic historians carries a danger of falsely attributing the invention of particular ideas to the composer of the texts in which it they are found. Not all of the ideas or arguments developed in a given historical text can be ascribed to the act of redaction which produced it. To understand what was novel and what was inherited in a given historical text, we need tools to investigate how particular authors worked, what sources were available to them, and how any given work was assembled from existing bodies of text to either reproduce, recast, or create new meanings. Despite the current vogue for treating the composers of our texts as agentic actors,

⁴² Suggested already in 1970 by R. Paret. See his, 'The Legendary *Futūḥ* Literature', in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008).

little sustained work has been done to illustrate the nature, extent, and limitations of their agency in practice.⁴³ This is remarkable because, as I will demonstrate, the *isnād-khabar* mode of historical writing gives us enviable tools with which to undertake this work.

Most *isnād*-study has been devoted to trying either to identify the golden *isnād* which will lead us to ‘true’ information about the origins of Islam,⁴⁴ or to reconstruct the non-extant work of particular historians which lies behind our extant sources.⁴⁵ My aims are closer to the latter approach, though will be distinct in that I do not consider the reconstruction of lost ur-texts as the ultimate goal. Rather, in the second and third parts of this dissertation I will show how we may use the *isnāds* in *Futūḥ Miṣr* to outline discrete, pre-existing packages of text which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used to write his work, and therefore pinpoint the specific narrative effects and meanings created by his juxtaposition of historical information which was unrelated before he combined it in *Futūḥ Miṣr*. This is, I propose, how we may move beyond what is fast becoming the truism that early Islamic historians exerted authorship

⁴³ C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 30-8 concludes that compilers like al-Ṭabari were authors, but has little scholarship to reference on their authorial practices.

⁴⁴ The paradigmatic example of which is A. Görke and G. Schoeler, *Die ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muḥammads: das Korpus 'Urwa ibn az-Zubair* (Princeton, 2008). See, critically, S. Shoemaker, ‘In Search of ‘Urwa’s *Sīra*: Some Methodological Issues in the Quest for “Authenticity” in the Life of Muḥammad’, *Der Islam* 85.2 (2011), pp. 257-344. In response, A. Görke, H. Motzki, and G. Schoeler, ‘First Century Sources for the Life of Muḥammad? A Debate’, in *Der Islam* 89.2 (2012), pp. 2-59.

⁴⁵ See attempts to identify Abū Mikhnaḥ in S. Mourad, ‘On Early Islamic Historiography: Abu Isma‘il al-Azdi and his *Futuh al-Sham*, in *JAOS* 120 (2000), pp. 577-93; Sayf b. ‘Umar in S. Anthony, *The caliph and the heretic* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 9-18; and various early Syrian authorities in J. Scheiner, *Die Eroberung von Damaskus: Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zur Historiographie in klassisch-islamischer Zeit* (Leiden, Boston, 2010), conclusions at pp. 475-7; on Syria, see also A. Elad, ‘The Beginnings of Historical Writing by the Arabs: The Earliest Syrian Writers on the Arab Conquests,’ *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003), pp. 65-152. On the pitfalls of reconstruction, see L. Conrad, ‘Recovering lost texts: Some methodological issues’, *JAOS* 113 (1993), pp. 258-63.

through selection and arrangement, start to talk about what specific individuals were authoring and why, and develop methods for distinguishing between the historical agendas of our ninth- and tenth-century compilers and those of their direct and indirect informants. If this methodology can be substantiated it will allow us to analyse some of the logics of redaction in the transmission of historical information in the early Islamic period, rather than view it as an impenetrable, chaotic process of accumulated misunderstanding.

In essence, the major obstacle to producing good studies of the agency of our earliest extant Arabic historians has been that because they are our earliest extant Arabic historians, we cannot see the materials with which they were working independently of their citation of them. Definitive conclusions about how they used, abused and transformed them are thus hard to make. This situation can be contrasted with sophisticated work done on historians operating in later periods of Islamic history, for example Konrad Hirschler's *Medieval Arabic Historiography*.⁴⁶ Hirschler is aided in outlining the different authorial personalities of the thirteenth century historians Ibn Wāṣil and Abū Shāma by his access to most of the sources they used in writing their works. He is thus able to contrast the different ways in which they deployed their source material and the motivations and worldviews which these deployments expose. We will never be in such a fortunate position for our earliest Arabic historians. However, if selection and arrangement are the dual elements of early Arabic historical authorship, the inaccessibility of our authors' sources – be it through their non-

⁴⁶ Konrad Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic historiography: authors as actors* (London, 2006), see especially pp. 86-114.

survival or their oral nature – only impinges upon our ability to comment on our authors’ activity as selectors. Their arrangement remains a viable line of enquiry, indeed, a line of enquiry for which we have been granted remarkable resources. Whereas major philological effort and often speculation has gone into distinguishing different bodies of material from which particular western or Byzantine medieval chronicles were composed, *isnād-khabar* history-writing handily breaks our historical texts into their component parts and provides purported origins for each part.⁴⁷ The problem this generates is one of manageability. The modestly-sized *Futūḥ Miṣr* contains 1,224 *isnāds* by my count. A similar enumeration of the *isnāds* in al-Ṭabarī’s *Ta’rīkh* would undoubtedly produce a five-figure sum. This helps to explain why no-one has previously, to my knowledge, conducted a total analysis of the *isnāds* of any given Arabic history.⁴⁸

The bedrock of this study is a table recording every *isnād* found in *Futūḥ Miṣr* and its page reference, arranged in an Excel spreadsheet which I have attached to the thesis in a spreadsheet. By sorting different columns in the spreadsheet alphabetically, it is possible to quickly view the distribution of citations of any given authority within FM, and the patterns of transmission which are associated with them. It is effectively a *Musnad* which can be reconfigured at the click of a mouse-button. Whenever I make claims about numbers or

⁴⁷ A recent example being the section ‘The Sources of Text I’ in M. Featherstone, J. Signes-Codoner (eds.) *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati Nomine Fertur Libri I-IV* (Berlin, 2015), pp. 9-13. This kind of work results in the repeated summaries of different Byzantine historians’ main sources, in W. Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke, 2013). For a recent piece of western medieval chronicle detective work, *The Winchcombe and Coventry chronicles : hitherto unnoticed witnesses to the work of John of Worcester*, ed. and tr. P. Hayward (Tempe, 2010).

⁴⁸ See the Appendix for a horrifyingly long chart detailing all 1,224 *isnāds* in FM.

patterns of citations within a section of FM, this table is where the evidence is held, and will be referenced as such.⁴⁹ Even with such digital tools, this work might be so immense as to be unrewarding if all of the *isnāds* in a book were different, resulting in hundreds, even thousands of transmission histories to trace. However, this is not the case. For example, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s five most frequently-used direct authorities in *Futūḥ Miṣr* stand at the head of 570 *isnāds* in total: 47% of the *isnāds* in the entire book.⁵⁰ Frequently these commonly-used direct authorities are themselves heavily reliant on a single earlier authority. Seventy-seven of the 152 *isnāds* headed by ʿAbd al-Malik b. Maslama give Ibn Lahīʿa as his authority. Fifty-one of the eighty-eight *isnāds* for whom Yaḥyā b. Bukayr is the direct informant lead next to al-Layth b. Saʿd. Further patterns are discernible. Of those fifty-one reports citing < Yaḥyā b. Bukayr – al-Layth >, forty present dates of significant events on al-Layth’s authority in a dry, formulaic manner which therefore looks as if it is culled from an annalistic history written by al-Layth. This same transmission link to < Yaḥyā b. Bukayr – al-Layth > can be found at the end of *isnāds* in the *Taʾrīkh* of Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ and the *Taʾrīkh madīnat Dimashq* of Ibn ʿAsākir,

⁴⁹ The time which goes into compiling such a spreadsheet is, of course, considerable. Next year I intend to collaborate with a computer scientist to write a program which can ‘scrape’ the *isnāds* from a digitised Arabic text, based on *isnāds*’ relative predictability of form. The program will no doubt have to be fairly sophisticated to deal with the variations which do exist (e.g. *ḥaylūla*, where an *isnād* is interrupted at a given transmitter in order to give an alternative line of transmission back to that transmitter, followed by the rest of the *isnād*), but with advances in machine learning and the fact that my hand-made table can function as a model of the desired output from a given input (the text of FM), it should not be too difficult. At that point, the number and distribution of *isnāds* used in a given *isnād-khabar* text should be available on command. This should allow the kind of analyses which I undertake in this thesis to be done much more quickly, enabling comparative work which will not readily happen otherwise.

⁵⁰ Again, the chart in the appendix is the root of these figures.

and multiple other sources.⁵¹ In a chapter, which because of the word-limit I have had to excise from the thesis, I prove that the *isnāds* in these multiple works all leading back to < Yaḥyā b. Bukayr – al-Layth > are in fact *riwāyas* to an annal written by al-Layth, which each of these authors repeatedly excerpts.⁵² Thus, a single line of transmission which is repeatedly invoked in *Futūḥ Miṣr* and used to present material on a common topic in a common form, can be shown to indicate a pre-existing source used by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. This accords with recent work done by Jens Scheiner and Ahmad Atassi on *riwāyas* found as *isnāds* in later books, and suggests that we can judiciously apply similar techniques to partially excavate the sources of our earliest Arabic texts.⁵³

Once such a source is identified, we can go about assessing its nature as best we can, and the uses to which it was put by a composer like Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. The repeated *isnāds* to al-Layth’s annalistic material are one of the clearest examples in *Futūḥ Miṣr* of what I call a *riwāya-isnād* leading to a ‘package’ of information. My working definition of a ‘package’ in this

⁵¹ These are the *Kitāb al-wulāt wa-l-quḍāt* of al-Kindī (d. 350/961), the *Ta’rīkh Baghdād* of al-Khaṭīb (d. 463/1071), the *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya* of Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), and the *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* and *Iṣāba fī tamayīz al-ṣaḥāba* of Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449).

⁵² The chapter proves the existence of al-Layth’s *Annal* from these quotations, and outlines its nature and perspective as well as how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used it. I am happy to present it on request. Ibn ‘Asākir quotes al-Layth’s *Annal* over a hundred times. The smoking gun is the fact that on two occasions each of the three witnesses ascribes exactly the same piece of information to al-Layth’s *Annal*. Compare FM 198, TD 59/58, TKh, 226; and FM 233-4, TD 57/255, TKh, 261. On many more occasions the same information is duplicated in two of these witnesses.

⁵³ Jens Scheiner has shown that some multiply-used *isnāds* in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq* are in fact internal *riwāyas* to earlier texts such as Abū ‘Ubayd’s *Kitāb al-amwāl*, see his ‘Single Isnāds or Riwāyas? Quoted Books in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī’, in M. Pomerantz and A. Shahin (eds.), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 42-72. On this, see also A. Atassi, ‘The Transmission of Ibn Sa’d’s Biographical Dictionary *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*,’ *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 12 (2012), pp. 56-80.

sense is a set of data which was seen as coherent and connected, and which was transmitted as a whole. We might consider these packages proto-books, but I avoid the term book because of its strong association with the written medium and its evocation for the modern reader of a single, fixed and published text. In contrast, these packages should probably be considered akin to more or less well-organised dictations on particular topics, supported by written notes, passed on from master to pupil, and supplemented by the pupil with quoted passages of relevant information from other sources.⁵⁴

The second half of my thesis will show how we may plausibly identify such packages within *Futūḥ Miṣr*, and present the most important packages, their main features, and their distribution throughout the work. Particular attention will be paid to how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used certain packages as the ‘backbone’ of his text. By this, I mean that in certain sections of *Futūḥ Miṣr* we can see that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used a pre-existing ‘backbone’ account as the basis for all the narrative development, while supplementing this account by interjecting material from other sources into it. These moments where Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam intervened in the narrative of a pre-existing text, I argue, are our best indications of how he read his sources, what he thought was important in them which needed to be emphasised, or what he thought was lacking in them and needed to be added. This kind of investigation is, I believe,

⁵⁴ Gregor Schoeler should be consulted for these processes, see his, *The oral and the written in early Islam* (Abingdon, 2006) and, *The genesis of literature in Islam: From the aural to the read* (Edinburgh, 2009). For a quick breakdown of the peculiarities of Islamic transmission of law, most of which is applicable to history, see Harald Motzki, ‘The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: The case of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf’, in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003), pp. 172-3.

particularly exciting because it offers us the prospect of being able to trace the changing uses of a piece of historical information through its incorporation in different narrative structure, and therefore how the valences of particular events in history might change over time for their transmitters. The thesis will culminate in an assessment of what the distribution of packages can tell us about the underlying structure and construction of *Futūḥ Miṣr*, how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s macro-organisation reflects the apparent nature and concerns of his sources, how it appears to differ from what went before, and what this tells us about his historical project.

Simply put, by examining how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam combined and juxtaposed different packages of information, and how he supplemented these packages with information which the *isnāds* suggest that he collected himself or introduced from alternative packages, I will be able to analyse in a concrete way the choices he was making when writing his history and the effects he intended. My intention is that this will allow me to distinguish between the literary and polemical effects which he inherited from his source material and those which he contributed himself. This is, I propose, how we may best assess Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial agency and strategies, and offers tools to help us appropriately historicise particular configurations of ideas which we find in his text. I hope it will offer future researchers tools with which we may deepen our understanding of the activity and agendas of other historians of the early Islamic period, ultimately contributing to a far more rigorous understanding of the (re-)uses and meanings of the past in the early Islamic period, and how they shifted over time.

An overview of the thesis

As mentioned earlier, Part I of the thesis consists of three chapters which explore *Futūḥ Miṣr* as a whole, literary text which can be understood as an instantiation of the historical world-view of its composer. Chapter One presents a brief history of Islamic Egypt up to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time followed by a biography of him and his family, focussing on the upheavals they experienced in the third/ninth century. It proposes that *Futūḥ Miṣr*’s celebration of two early Muslim generals whose ancestors had recently led an armed insurrection against the re-imposition of ‘Abbāsid control in Egypt would not have been neutral data, and shows how recognising this helps us to locate Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s perspective on these changes. Chapter Two focusses on how *Futūḥ Miṣr* is structured to draw attention to the historic links between the Arabs and the Copts, and how *Futūḥ Miṣr* uses the label ‘Copt’ to construct an autochthonous Egyptian population whose failure to recognise prophetic invitations – in both ‘biblical’ time and the era of the Arab conquests – justifies their subjection to an Arab Muslim regime, even as it carves out a protected place for them within Egypt. Chapter Three examines how the pre-Islamic history which prefaces *Futūḥ Miṣr*’s story of the Arab conquest of Egypt is used to present that act as the next step of a progression of sacred history, an enactment of a repeating paradigm of divine intervention in Egypt.

Part II of the thesis, sub-titled ‘Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical method’, contains three chapters which each illuminate features of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical practice which are

important prerequisites for the stratigraphic reading of *Futūḥ Miṣr* performed in Part III. Chapter Four examines in detail Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s quotations of Ibn Hishām’s recension of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*, the one extant source which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam cites on multiple occasions. It demonstrates how strict his reproduction of his source texts was, and the limited ways in which he was willing to recast it through paraphrase, partial quotation, and breaking up continuous texts into multiple *khābars*. More importantly, this chapter allows us to observe Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam relocating these excerpts from the *Sīra* into new – and newly meaning-endowing – narrative contexts, transforming their implications to suit his purposes. Chapter Five performs a limited *isnād-cum-matn* analysis on a set of *ḥadīths* found in *Futūḥ Miṣr* which had also been taught to Ibn Ishāq by the Egyptian Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb in Alexandria in 737. The close correspondence between these *ḥadīths* as found in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s *Musnad*, with purely Iraqi lines of transmission back to Ibn Ishāq and Yazīd, and *Futūḥ Miṣr*, with purely Egyptian lines of transmission back to Yazīd, is used to argue that both texts are good independent witnesses to Yazīd’s teaching before his death in 128/745-6. This makes it plausible that *Futūḥ Miṣr*’s *isnāds* are a reliable guide to the original content and transmission-history of the texts they accompany as far back to the first half of the second/eighth century. This is important because this is the period from which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam claims that his main narrative historical accounts originate. Chapter Six shows how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam explicitly signals when he was repeatedly returning to an earlier extended account which formed the backbone of his narrative. While he often refers to these ‘backbone’ accounts in abbreviated terms, I demonstrate that he provides a full *riwāya-isnād* when he began to use such a backbone source. These *riwāya-isnāds* allow us to identify the origins and transmission-

history of the narrative accounts which were the framework around which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam built *Futūḥ Miṣr*.

Part III of the thesis is the stratigraphic reading of *Futūḥ Miṣr* which has been enabled by Part II, showing the different authorial techniques which we can observe Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam using when writing different sections of his work. Chapter Seven demonstrates how he built his pre-Islamic history around a pre-existing king-list of ancient rulers, which only briefly mentioned the activity of the ancient prophets in Egypt, and how he supplemented it with a body of stories-of-prophets (*qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*) which had originated outside Egypt, while also adding introductory and concluding sections drawn from different sources. Chapter Eight shows that all of the narrative-historical sections of *Futūḥ Miṣr* were built around four pre-existing accounts and explores the different concerns of each of these accounts, their authors, and how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam combined them and reshaped them by weaving other reports into their narratives and adding prefatory and concluding sections. The chapter concludes by turning to the larger arrangement of *Futūḥ Miṣr*. It argues that the common transmission history of three of its main conquest-accounts suggests that they had been combined and transmitted together two generations before Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was writing, and that his macro-arrangement was in part simply a more ambitious continuation of an earlier tradition of *futūḥ*-writing in Egypt. Finally, Chapter Nine examines the sections of *Futūḥ Miṣr* which had not been part of this package of *futūḥ* - on the urban history of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, the Islamic judges of Egypt, and the *ḥadīths* transmitted with purely Egyptian *isnāds* - asking how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was recasting this Egyptian tradition of conquest-history by composing these new

sections and adding them to it. In sum, this thesis is the first systematic study of the sources, structure, and authorship of an early Arabic history, which both tests and expands our current understanding of the dynamics of early Islamic historical writing, and sheds light on numerous aspects of the changing uses of the past among the Muslim scholars of Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid Egypt.

Manuscripts and editions

As will be clear from the preceding introduction, much of my analysis consists of reading the arrangement of *Futūḥ Miṣr* as resulting from choices made by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam. It is thus necessary to comment on the nature of the known manuscripts of FM and what they indicate about the stability of the text and its arrangement. In 1922 Torrey knew of four manuscripts, which he named A to D. Ms A dates to the sixth/twelfth century, ms B to 585/1190, ms C to 776/1375, and ms D to 973/1566. Mss A, B, and C are full copies of FM, containing all seven *qjzāʾ*, with each *juzʾ* introduced with either a full or partial *riwāya*. Ms D, bound as part of a composite volume, is an abridgement of the text which nonetheless preserves material from each *juzʾ*, though the introductory passages of some of the *qjzāʾ* have been lost in the abridgement. A fifth manuscript, unknown to Torrey, has now been found located in the Suleymaniyya library in Istanbul.⁵⁵ Dated slightly earlier than Torrey's oldest manuscripts A

⁵⁵ Fatih Collection no. 4442. It is dated to 531/1136. I have not been able to view this ms myself, and thus rely on Christopher Wright's comments and an inspection of the pages reproduced in his thesis, C. Wright, 'Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam's Futuh Misr', pp. 17-18.

and B, it is perhaps the clearest of all the manuscripts, but is reportedly ‘almost word for word identical to the copy found in London’, i.e. the manuscript which was the basis for Torrey’s edition.⁵⁶

Mss A, C, D, and ‘Istanbul’ all share the same *riwāya*, which is as follows:

- > Al-Silafī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abū Ṭāhir, d. 576/1180.⁵⁷
- > Murshid b. Yaḥyā, Abū Ṣādiq al-Madīnī *thumma* al-Miṣrī, d. 517/1124.⁵⁸
- > Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Munīr b. Aḥmad al-Khallāl, d. 439/1048-9.⁵⁹
- > Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Faraj al-Qammāḥ, d. ?⁶⁰
- > Ibn Qudayd, ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan, Abū al-Qāsim, d. 312/925-6.⁶¹

The *riwāya* of ms B is:

- > Al-Kindī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, Abū ‘Umar, d. 350/961.
- > Ibn Qudayd, d. d. 312/925-6

As such, Ibn Qudayd is the common *rāwī* from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam for all manuscripts, from whom we have two separate lines of transmission. Despite this divergent line of transmission, ‘[t]he text of B differs in no important respect from that of A . . . [t]here is, indeed, only one type of text of the *Futūḥ Miṣr*’.⁶² Torrey notes that all of the texts share common errors, including a misplaced four-page section, the odd misplaced clause, and various other ‘purely scribal errors’. Torrey identified the same errors in quotations of FM found in Yāqūt, Abū -l-

⁵⁶ Ibid. pp. 17-18.

⁵⁷ EI2, ‘al-Silafī’. SAN 21/5-39.

⁵⁸ HM 1/374-5, TI 11/282.

⁵⁹ HM 1/373, SAN 17/619.

⁶⁰ Unknown.

⁶¹ IY, 356.

⁶² Torrey, *Conquest of Egypt*, p. 11.

Maḥāsin, al-Maqrīzī, and al-Suyūṭī, suggesting that all known versions of FM derive from a single original, transmitted with such conservatism that these errors went uncorrected. The fact that these are found across the different transmissions from Ibn Qudayd, strongly suggests that all manuscripts reflect the form of Ibn Qudayd's copy of FM, thus potentially dating it to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's lifetime.⁶³ Torrey concluded that it 'cannot be doubted that the remarkably uniform text which we have before us is in reality what it professes to be, the text of Ibn Qudaid, transmitted from him with care'.⁶⁴ Torrey argued that the errors in the codex reflect the real possibility that Ibn Qudayd did not study directly with Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, but rather came into possession of a slightly defective text of FM, which he did not feel he had the authority to correct, not having studied with Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam himself.⁶⁵ As such, Torrey concluded that 'we can restore the text of Ibn Qudaid's codex with remarkable certainty, and in so doing can make a very close approximation to the text of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam himself'.⁶⁶ Further support for ascribing the text as it stands to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam is the fact that Ibn Qudayd's only intervention in the text, completing Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's list of chief judges of Egypt, is clearly marked as Ibn Qudayd's work.⁶⁷ If FM had still been a fluid

⁶³ Ibid, 16-19. Torrey also notes that minor features of ms B, attributed to al-Kindī's transmission from Ibn Qudayd, accord with what we know of al-Kindī's writing, and are a closer match to al-Kindī's citation of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam in his *Kitāb al-quḍāt wa-l-wulāt* than mss A, C, and D, supporting the notion that we do have two genuinely independent lines of transmission from Ibn Qudayd. The exception to the conformity across all of the mss is the correction in mss A and D of a misplaced chunk of text, probably due to a misplaced codex-leaf. Torrey, however, cannot find a justification for an independent common source for A and D (which share the same *riwāya*), and because the independent B and C share the error, the correction in A and D seems to be the result of later editing.

⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 16.

⁶⁵ Ibid, pp. 19-21.

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 21.

⁶⁷ FM 247.

text when Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam taught it, which Ibn Qudayd rearranged, we would expect more editorial interjections of the type we find Ibn Hishām continually making through his *riwāya* of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*. Rather, it seems most plausible to accept the ascription of the title pages of mss A, B, and C, which claim that the text, in its seven parts, was the *ta’līf* and *taṣnīf* of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, while Ibn Qudayd was its *rāwī* like the other figures in its *riwāya*.⁶⁸

Torrey considered that ms A, held in the British Library, was most accurate and used it as the basis for his edition. I have encountered no difference between Torrey’s edition and subsequently printed editions, and as such have used Torrey’s edition throughout.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Torrey, *Conquest of Egypt*, pp. 9-12.

⁶⁹ Other editions which I have consulted are *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-akhbāruhā* (Cairo, no date), *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-l-Maghrib* (Cairo, 1415 AH).

PART I

Survey: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and the worldview of *Futūḥ Miṣr*

Chapter One:

The ‘Abbāsīd context of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *Conquest*

The need for context

As outlined in the introduction, the first part of this dissertation explores the possibilities of reading FM as a coherent work compiled and taught in the mid-ninth century. I will argue that the overall narrative arrangement and content of FM forwards particular ideas about Egypt’s past that spoke to ninth-century concerns and debates. In the third part of this thesis, we will see that it is possible to pinpoint those overarching ideas which were already expressed in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s narrative sources, and which he thus inherited, and those which he manufactured or emphasised anew through the combination and juxtaposition of previously independent bodies of information. This will allow us to consider the changing uses to which conquest-history was put over time. At this point, however, we are primarily interested in trying to tease out some of the internal logics of FM’s narrative, as an expression of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical worldview. As such, it will be important to read the work as an integral whole, asking what patterns of historical causation are forwarded, how the different sections relate to each other, which themes are prevalent, and other such questions. However, a purely internal reading of the text will not develop our understanding of how this configuration of ideas might have been meaningful to either Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam or the students who learned it from him. An awareness of the social, political, and intellectual

circumstances in which FM arose is a prerequisite for this understanding.¹ This chapter will therefore outline the history of early Islamic Egypt in brief, focussing particularly on the events of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s lifetime and what we know of he and his family’s involvement in them.

We are extremely fortunate that the bibliophile and prosopographile Arabic culture of the classical period gives us considerable information with which to build up something of this nexus between historical writing and its contexts, a luxury unavailable to many pre-modern historians. Vast quantities of historical materials survive, enabling us to identify differing accounts of particular events, and the genre of ‘biographical dictionaries’ (*ṭabaqāt*) allows us to investigate the biographies and intellectual connections of thousands of scholars.² Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is an ideal author to use as a test-case for this kind of methodology. As well as the usual array of biographical dictionaries which give us information about him, his family, and the scholars he learned from and taught, we are particularly well served in reconstructing the history of Egypt during his lifetime by two works of a later Egyptian historian, Abū ʿUmar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Kindī al-Miṣrī, referred to henceforth as al-

¹ For an overview of the scholarship on ʿAbbāsid Egypt, see p. 32, n. 5.

² C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, pp. 61-6; W. al-Qadi, ‘Biographical Dictionaries: Inner Structure and Cultural Significance’, in G. Atiyeh, *The Book in the Islamic World* (New York), pp. 93-122; idem. ‘Biographical Dictionaries as the Scholars’ Alternative History of the Muslim Community’, in G. Endress (ed.), *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopaedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 23-76. Early non-Egyptian biographical dictionaries took some interest in Egyptians, but much of our biographical information on Egyptians derives from a now lost work by an Egyptian, Ibn Yūnus (d. 347/958). This is extensively cited by later biographers, to the extent that a two-volume ‘reconstruction’ of the text has been published based on these citations, see Ibn Yūnus, *Taʾrīkh* (Beirut, 2000).

Kindī (b. 897/283, d. 961/350). His key surviving historical works are a *Kitāb umarā' Miṣr* and a *Kitāb quḍāt Miṣr*, or *Book of Egypt's Governors* and *Book of Egypt's Judges*.³ Between these two works it is possible to construct a fairly detailed narrative of Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd Egypt from a Muslim perspective, and to identify the place of the family of our author within it. The most important source to complete the picture is the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, the semi-official history of the Coptic church produced and updated by multiple authors over the centuries which it covers.⁴

Egypt in the early Islamic period⁵

³ Both edited in R. Guest, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt* (Leiden, 1912).

⁴ *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, ed. and tr. O. Burmester, B. Evetts, A. Khater, A. Atiya (Paris, 1904-). On which see J. den Heijer, *Mawhūb Ibn Maṣṣūr Ibn Mufarriḡ et la rédaction du texte arabe de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie* (Louvain, 1989) and the more recent comments on its different recensions, J. den Heijer and P. Pilette, 'Transmission et diffusion de l'historiographie copto-arabe : nouvelles remarques sur les recensions primitive et vulgate de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie', in S. Tovar, J. Monferrer-Sala (eds.), *Cultures in Contact. Transfer of Knowledge in the Mediterranean Context* (Beyrouth, 2013), pp. 93-140.

⁵ The body of historical scholarship on early Islamic Egypt is limited compared to general scholarship on the caliphate, but growing. The key published overviews which touch on this period are H. Kennedy, 'Egypt as a province in the Islamic caliphate, 641-868', in M. Daly (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Egypt* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 62-85, and M. Brett, 'Egypt', in C. Robinson (ed.) *New Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 1 (Cambridge 2010), pp. 541-580. Useful information is also found in H. Kennedy, 'Central Government and Provincial Elites in the Early 'Abbāsīd Caliphate', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 44 (1981), pp. 26-38. More specialised, important works are M. Mikhail, *Byzantine to Islamic Egypt*, who stresses the continuing existence and role of Egypt's Christian population, and P. Sijpesteijn, *Shaping a Muslim state: The world of a mid-eighth-century Egyptian official* (Oxford, 2013), a view of the Umayyad period rooted in the papyrological evidence. M. Legendre, *Territory and Power: Early Islamic Administration in Middle Egypt (642-868)* (Chicago, forthcoming), will soon supplement this picture, detailing for the first time the changes in sub-provincial administration into the 'Abbāsīd period through a regional papyrological study. For now, consult idem, 'La Moyenne-Égypte du VII^e e au IX^e e siècle: Apports d'une perspective régionale à l'étude d'une société entre Byzance et l'Islam' (University of Paris-Sorbonne thesis, 2014). For a 'social' history, mainly focussed on the 'ulamā', see the excellent discussion in A. El Shamsy, *The canonization of Islamic law : a social and intellectual history* (New York, 2013), especially pp. 91-144, which now supersedes the

From its conquest around AD 641, Egypt had been ruled as part of the Islamic caliphate, originally based in Medina in the Arabian Ḥijāz and then centred on Damascus under the Umayyads. In the mid-eighth century the Umayyads were overthrown by a revolution whose primary military might came from the Persianised Arabs and Muslim-converted natives of eastern provinces of the caliphate, particularly Khurāsān. Egypt remained a province in the empire, now ruled by the ‘Abbāsīd dynasty from Iraq, first from a new-built capital at Baghdād, later from Sāmarrā’. As such, Egypt retained the role into which it had developed through late antiquity: the source of a considerable agricultural surplus which imperial centres elsewhere wished to extract. Egypt’s unique productivity relied on the Nile and the fertility engendered by its yearly inundations, carefully tapped and directed by an antique infrastructure of irrigation, with all production immediately moveable due to the Nile’s second function as transport artery.⁶ This was an economic system powerful enough to survive intact the breakdown in long-distance trans-regional trade which effected such significant changes elsewhere in the Mediterranean world after the break-up of the Roman

limited and occasionally confused section in S. Gellens, ‘Scholars and Travellers: The Social History of Early Muslim Egypt, 218-487/833-1094’ (Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1986). These published works should be supplemented with M. Dunn, ‘The Struggle for ‘Abbāsīd Egypt’ (Georgetown University Ph.D. thesis, 1975), a dissertation neatly organising the information found in al-Kindī and the *History of the Patriarchs*. On the military, see S. Bouderbala, ‘Ġund Miṣr : étude de l’administration militaire dans l’Égypte des débuts de l’Islam 21/642 – 218/833’ (Univ. Paris Ph.D. thesis, 2008). On conversion the stark relief of G. Frantz-Murphy, ‘Conversion in Early Islamic Egypt: the economic factor’, in Hoyland (ed.), *Muslims and Others in Early Islamic Society* (Ashgate, 2004) should be softened with the multiple nuanced articles by Arietta Papaconstantinou listed in the bibliography. For the Byzantine background, useful in considering the thorny issues surrounding Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians, R. Bagnall (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700* (Cambridge, 2007).

⁶ C. Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2005), pp.64-6.

empire.⁷ As such, perhaps more than anywhere else in the late antique world, the basic socio-economic life of Egypt remained largely continuous after the fall of the Roman empire.

The main change, of course, was in the presence of a new ruling class. Whereas previously Roman governors headed the administration from Alexandria, authority now resided with the Muslim *amīr* in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, modern Cairo. Arab settlement was initially focussed here in a garrison-city like al-Kūfa or al-Baṣra in Iraq, where the conquering elite were expected to settle, live off stipends provided by the state, and be ready for military service.⁸ Traditions in FM claim that originally the *muhājirūn* (emigrants) were prohibited other occupations, particularly farming, to retain their effectiveness as a military force and prevent assimilation.⁹ However as time passed, originally (and perhaps always somewhat idealised) strict societal and settlement delineation between Muslims and others became fuzzier. The Muslim population expanded beyond al-Fuṣṭāṭ and moved to other areas, and new groups of Muslims emigrated to Egypt and settled in non-urban settings, most significantly the Qaysī tribes settled in the eastern delta, or al-Ḥawf, from the 720s. It is from around this time that we begin to see Muslim landholding appear in the documentary evidence for Egypt.¹⁰

⁷ Ibid. pp.22-3.

⁸ On early settlement in *amṣār*, or garrison cities, see K. Athamina, 'Aʿrāb and Muhājirūn in the Environment of Amṣār', *Studia Islamica* 66 (1987), pp. 5-25.

⁹ FM 162.

¹⁰ P. Sijpesteijn, *Shaping*, pp. 81-4, 105-11. Though this was no doubt a slow and geographically patchy process. M. Legendre finds little papyrological evidence of landholders with Arab names in middle Egypt until the ninth century, 'La Moyenne-Égypte', p. 333.

The more integrated patterns of living which emerged must have played a key role in raising awareness of the reality of Islam amongst normal people and interrupting the Christian solidarity of local societies, which served as the preconditions for conversion on a wider scale. The question of the rate of conversion to Islam is dogged by lack of good evidence: the scholarly trend is for scholars to say very reasonable things about conversion, but then have to base hard conclusions on anecdotal reports or inadmissible samples of evidence.¹¹ The ninth century is often cited as the tipping-point to Islam in Egypt, but as Brett has noted this interpretation is ultimately reliant on a comment by the fifteenth-century author al-Maqrīzī, who in turn seems to be hanging a long and complicated process on a particular event, the suppression of the last major non-Muslim tax-rebellion.¹² Whatever its extent, the issues of conversion and assimilation were hot topics in our author's time, as demonstrated by Christian apocalyptic texts' protestations against conversion to Islam, hagiographers' dramatizing of the dangers of familiarity with Muslims, and Muslim authors' complaints about the difficulties of distinguishing between Christians and Muslims.¹³

¹¹ R. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), for a thoughtful discussion and an inadequate statistical approach to conversion using biographical dictionaries.

¹² Brett, 'Egypt', p. 454; al-Maqrīzī's comment is also made the interpretational basis for the otherwise thorough analysis of 'Abbāsid Egyptian political history in Dunn, 'Struggle for 'Abbāsid Egypt'. Tamer el-Leithy, 'Coptic culture and conversion in medieval Cairo, 1293–1524 A.D.' (Princeton University Ph.D. thesis, 2005), argues for an Egyptian non-Muslim majority into the Mamluk period. See his *Coptic Muslims: Religious Difference and Conversion in Medieval Egypt* (forthcoming).

¹³ The *Apocalypse* of ps-Athanasios, written in the early eighth century, claims that 'many Christians, and Barbarians, and (people from) Basan and Syrians, and (from) all tribes will go and join them in their faith, wanting to become free from the sufferings that they will bring upon the earth', translated in F. Martinez, 'Eastern Christian apocalyptic in the early Muslim period: Pseudo-Methodius and Pseudo-Athanasius' (Catholic University of America Ph.D. thesis, 1985), p. 528. Mikhail, *Byzantine to Islamic Egypt*, pp. 58–60, 64–70, collects references to conversion in various early Islamic period Christian literary sources from Egypt. On hagiography in this period more generally

Egypt's administration after the conquest displays considerable continuity from the Byzantine period in terms of both organisation and personnel. That said, recent scholarship on the early papyrus documents has shown innovative practices introduced after the conquest and an increase in centralised scrutiny of tax-collection, suggesting that the conquerors brought their own ideas about administration and applied them to the pre-existing system.¹⁴ But the fiscal administration continued to operate in Greek until the early eighth century. When it was shifted to Arabic, late in 'Abd al-Malik's rule or at the beginning of al-Walīd's, it seems to have been part of a decisive shift towards more direct centralised control over Egypt's local administration.¹⁵ As in the rest of the empire, the native administrative class dominated it until this point and continued to play an important but diminishing role, with Christian officials still occasionally attested at the highest levels into the ninth century when our author was writing (and beyond).¹⁶

Under both the Umayyads and the 'Abbāsids, *amīrs* were appointed to rule Egypt from the centre of the empire by the caliph. These governors were generally outsiders to the province, often members of the ruling dynasties, relying on the co-operation of local members of the

see T. Sizgorich, 'Mind the gap: Accidental conversion and the hagiographic imaginary in the first centuries A.H.', in A. Papaconstantinou et al (eds.), *Conversion in late antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and beyond* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 163-74; A. Chrysostomides, "'There is no god but God": Islamisation and Religious Code Switching, eighth to tenth centuries', in A. Peacock (ed.), *Islamisation: Comparative perspectives from history* (Edinburgh, 2017), pp. 118-33.

¹⁴ Points stressed by P. Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the beginning of Muslim rule', in Bagnall (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 444-6.

¹⁵ M. Legendre, 'La Moyenne-Égypte', p.331.

¹⁶ M. Dunn, 'Struggle', pp.153-5.

elite to operate the levers of government. The two officials of the governor about whom we hear most were the police-chief (*ṣāhib al-shurṭa*) and the chief judge (*qāḍī*). The police-chief held responsibility for law and order and often (though not always) led the *jund* (provincial army) in the governor's absence, while the chief judge was the leading Muslim religio-legal authority in the province.¹⁷ Originally, both these posts were generally held by members of the close-knit Arab aristocracy (*wujūh*) whose status in Egypt was legitimised by descent from the original conquerors of Egypt.¹⁸ In the 'Abbāsid period, however, Baghdad (and later Sāmarrāʾ) seems to have tried to assert more direct authority in the province. This has been linked by Kennedy to the reluctance of the Egyptians (*ahl Miṣr*) in the *jund* (provincial army, based in al-Fuṣṭāṭ) to suppress tax revolts by fellow-Arabs settled in the eastern Delta.¹⁹ In response, we see caliphs dispatching governors to Egypt accompanied by contingents of non-Egyptian troops to break up the Egyptian solidarity of the *jund*.²⁰ Over time, state forces in

¹⁷ On the role of the *ṣāhib al-shurṭa* and the *qāḍīs* in Egypt, see Bouderbala, 'Ġund Miṣr', pp. 248-60, 268-76, respectively. The most recent and comprehensive study on the early Islamic judiciary is M. Tillier, *L'invention du cadi : la justice des musulmans, des Juifs et des chrétiens aux premiers siècles de l'Islam* (Paris, 2017).

¹⁸ Kennedy, in 'Egypt as a province', uses the term *wujūh* for the notables of Egypt, following the term most commonly used by al-Kindī, attested forty-one times in KWQ in contrast to say *ashrāf*, used only fourteen times. The term is also attested in indigenous biographical sources, e.g. IY 1/392, 2/131, 239, 397.

¹⁹ H. Kennedy, 'Egypt as Province', pp. 78-80. Most notably in 168/784 when the Egyptians (*ahl Miṣr*) of the *jund* chose to abandon their own governor to his death rather than fight fellow Arabs of the Delta who had rebelled against increased taxes, KWQ 126-7. The same thing happened to al-Layth b. al-Faḍl in 186/802, though al-Layth survived, KWQ 140,

²⁰ Al-Layth, the governor mentioned in the note above, wrote to Hārūn al-Rashīd saying that he could not collect taxes in the Delta without the caliph sending him an army, KWQ 140. In 169/785 al-Mahdī sent his new governor to Egypt with an army from Syria so large that it required separate commanders for the contingents from Qinnasrīn, Ḥims, Damascus, Jordan, and Palestine, KWQ 129. Bouderbala, 'Ġund Miṣr', pp. 319-25, provides a useful list of Egyptian *shurṭa* chiefs and their tribal affiliations up to 218/833, which allows us to track the ebbing power of local families in the *jund*. Up to c. 164/780 almost *aṣḥāb al-shurṭa* come from the southern tribes who settled Egypt after the conquest: Tujīb, Ḥaḍramawt, Ḥimyar, Kalb, and Balī, with the Fahmī descendents of Khālīd b. Thābit

Egypt were, in line with the rest of the caliphate, increasingly made up of the eastern military forces – Persianised Arabs, Islamised Persians, and, from later in al-Ma'mūn's reign, Turks – which had brought the 'Abbāsids to power.²¹ The important role of the Khurāsānī faction (*ahl Khurāsān*) in Egyptian politics through the succession crisis following the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd and the subsequent tumults in the 810s and 820s – most notable in their deposition of al-Amīn's governor and declaration for al-Ma'mūn – suggest that by this point troops of eastern origin held more sway in Egypt than the traditional *wujūh*.²²

The final blow to the Arab military role in Egypt seems to have been the removal of all Arabs from the stipend-rolls (*dīwān*) in 833.²³ This followed seventeen years of extremely destructive civil war from 809/19 until 826/211, instigated by the caliphate-wide conflict between al-Amīn and al-Ma'mūn. During this period Egypt was effectively independent from

providing a Qaysī counterweight. Presumably these men were local deputies whose job was to provide the link between governors from elsewhere and Egyptian networks of power. From 164/780-202/817 the *shurṭa* chiefs are still Arab, but barely any come from the local Egyptian tribes whose members previously monopolised the office. It is likely that these were Arab officers, perhaps *abnā'*, who had accompanied 'Abbāsīd governors dispatched from the east to Egypt. From 202/817-218/833, the period of al-Ma'mūn's authority in Egypt, there are barely any Arabs. The *shurṭa* chiefs were now mostly Iranians from the family of the governor/pretender al-Sarī b. al-Ḥakam, or from Khurāsān or Bukhāra.

²¹ For the rise of Turkish slave-soldiery, see M. Gordon, *The breaking of a thousand swords: A history of the Turkish military of Samarra (A.H. 200-275/815-889 C.E.)* (New York, 2001), esp. pp. 15-46. Kennedy states that the army that re-imposed caliphal control was made up of *abnā'* of Khurāsānī origin, Iranians, and Turks: 'Few of these troops were Arab in origin and none of them were Egyptians', 'Egypt as a province', p. 82.

²² This is a central plank of Dunn's argument in 'Struggle', summarised pp. 128-9. At KWQ 148 we are told that the leader of the rising in Egypt against al-Amīn was al-Sarī b. al-Ḥakam, a Khurāsānī who had arrived in Egypt as part of an earlier 'Abbāsīd governor's army. See AZ 3/82.

²³ First reported by al-Kindī, KWQ 193, and much repeated in later sources and secondary literature. See the discussion by D. Ayalon, 'The military reforms of caliph al-Mu'taṣim: Their background and consequences', in his, *Islam and the abode of war* (Aldershot, 1994).

the rest of the caliphate under the control of the warring factions of the Khurāsānī-dominated *jund* in al-Fuṣṭāṭ and a northern alliance of Arab tribes centred on the eastern Delta, leaders of both sides claiming loyalty to the whichever claimant to the caliphate they wished whilst retaining the tax revenues of their sphere of control.²⁴ The course of this bloody civil war appears to have dealt a final blow to the traditional Arab notables (*wujūh*) of Egypt.²⁵ In 826/211 al-Ma'mūn's leading general 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir finally re-imposed caliphal authority over Egypt by force. However, the peace did not last long. Once the province had been handed over to the governorship of the caliph's brother al-Mu'taṣim in 829, successive rebellions by the Arabs of the Delta were eventually joined by Arab tribal groupings from upper Egypt and Alexandria led by Arab aristocrats claiming descent from heroes of the original Arab conquest. These insurrections, combined with a major rising of non-Muslim Egyptians in the western Delta, triggered increasingly punitive expeditions firstly by al-Mu'taṣim, then the central Asian general al-Afshīn, and finally the caliph al-Ma'mūn himself (the first time an 'Abbāsīd caliph had come to Egypt). The caliph oversaw in 832/217 the final and ruthless suppression of what Kennedy described as this 'unprecedented alliance of local interests', culminating in large scale execution, deportation, and enslavement of the Christians of the rebellious enclave of Bashmūr.²⁶ Even Muslim rebels

²⁴ The narrative is complex: Kennedy, 'Egypt as a Province', pp. 80-2, synthesises. See Dunn, 'Struggle', pp. 51-85, for the details. Note that Dunn uses the term *jund* for the caliphal army based in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, whereas Kennedy restricts it to the Arab-dominated military. I follow Dunn.

²⁵ Kennedy notes a massacre of one of the leading Arab aristocratic families of Alexandria and a mass-drowning of *jund* leaders, 'Egypt as a province', p. 81.

²⁶ Dunn, 'Struggle', pp. 77-85; Kennedy, 'Egypt as Province', pp. 83-4. See HP 1/494-5 for the executions and deportations, confirmed by al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rikh* (Leiden, 1883), v. 2, p. 529 and KWQ 192.

were captured and executed.²⁷ Both al-Kindī and the *History of the Patriarchs* characterise the rising as being provoked by harsh taxation., The fact that main elements of these rebellions were Arabs with deep roots in Egypt rising against a *jund* now made up of *abnā'*, Iranians, and Turks, plus the effective disenfranchisement of all Arabs by removal from the *dīwān* in the aftermath of these revolts' suppression, suggests a final convulsion in which the old Arab elite made their last attempt to resist a state-directed shift of power away from them.²⁸

Aside from a minor rising by the Arabs of the Delta in response to the removal of Arabs from the *dīwān*, there was no more military-political disturbance in Egypt during the lifetime of our author until the Ṭulūnid takeover which came at the very end of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's life.²⁹ While of great significance, at the time Ibn Ṭulūn's actions probably appeared just another shift between tight and loose caliphal oversight of Egyptian governors. This calm testifies to the success of al-Mu'taṣim and al-Ma'mūn's final suppression of Egyptian military resistance to the expansion of direct caliphal power in the province. From now, on not only governors were almost exclusively of eastern origin, but also the chiefs of police.³⁰ The lack of Arab military clout in Egypt is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the revolt in response

²⁷ KWQ 190-191.

²⁸ KWQ, 185, has the revolts begin in response to al-Mu'taṣim's new finance chief Ṣāliḥ b. Shīrẓād's oppression of the people and raising of taxes. HP 487 explains the Christians' rebellion through 'the extortion practised by the two overseers of taxes'. Kennedy, 'Egypt as a province', p. 84, characterises the aftermath of the rising as 'the destruction of the early Islamic order'.

²⁹ Kennedy, 'Egypt as a province', p. 84.

³⁰ See above, p. 37, n. 20.

to the removal of ‘Arabs’ from the stipend-registers could muster only 500 men, who were easily dispatched by al-Mu‘taṣim’s governor.³¹

At the same time, caliphal policy seems to have been to appoint chief judges who were not only outsiders, but of the Ḥanafī school of law which was dominant in Iraq but almost alien to Egypt, where followers of Mālīkī jurisprudence were the majority. Tsafirir has termed this policy ‘an official, forced introduction of Hanfism through governmental appointments’, and it seems clear that the introduction of Ḥanafī judges from Iraq or Khurāsān was designed to extend central power in the provinces and remove judicial blocks to governors’ actions.³² For example, one Egyptian Mālīkī chief judge was removed for refusing to allow a Khurāsānī governor to intervene on the behalf of a defendant in a court-case.³³ Another was sacked when he refused to enforce the *miḥna*, the caliphal inquisition.³⁴ In both of these cases, Ḥanafīs from Khurāsān were appointed in their stead, and al-Kindī repeatedly reports that tensions arose when these judges made rulings in contravention of Egyptian legal practice. The aforementioned Ḥanafī judge appointed by al-Sarī was so unpopular that the Egyptians drove him out of the congregational mosque and he had to set up his court at home, and on more than one occasion governors or caliphs seem to have had to appease local opinion by appointing Mālīkī judges.³⁵

³¹ KWQ 194.

³² N. Tsafirir, *The History of an Islamic School of Law: The Early Spread of Hanafism* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004), pp. 96-8.

³³ KWQ 427.

³⁴ A. El Shamsy, ‘Tradition to Law’, pp.128,130.

³⁵ Ibid. 103-6, 122-3.

The culmination of this trend of outsider Ḥanafī judges appointed to impose centralised directives and support the power of the caliphate's military regime in al-Fuṣṭāṭ came with the appointment of Ibn Abī al-Layth, a Ḥanafī from Khawārz̄m in Central Asia. Ibn Abī al-Layth was parachuted in to step up the prosecution of the *miḥna*. The *miḥna*, or inquisition was ostensibly a high theological debate over whether the Koran was created or not, the details of which debate need not detain us now.³⁶ It has been effectively argued, however, that the real issue at stake was an attempt by the caliph al-Ma'mūn, and his successors al-Mu'taṣim and al-Wāthiq, to assert their right to determine Islamic doctrine, informed by an idea of the caliphs' successorship to Muḥammad's role as religious leader.³⁷ This right was denied by the 'ulamā' (men of religious learning), who increasingly saw doctrine as emerging from a combination of the Koran, the conduct of Muḥammad enshrined in *ḥadīth*, and the consensus of the community in which the caliph was just another Muslim. These caliphs asserted that the Koran was created, and demanded that judges, court-officials, lawyers, and theologians subscribe to their position or be prohibited from state service and legal practice.³⁸ High-profile refusers were publicly flogged by the caliphal authorities, generally

³⁶ See the discussions by M.Hinds, 'Miḥna', EI2; various articles by J. Nawas, 'A Reexamination of Three Current Explanations for al-Ma'mūn's Introduction of the Miḥna', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (1994), pp. 615-29; idem. 'The Miḥna of 218 A. H./833 A. D. Revisited: An Empirical Study', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996), pp. 698-708, and now idem. *Al-Ma'mūn, the inquisition, and the quest for caliphal authority* (Atlanta, 2015); a different view is proposed by N. Hurvitz, 'Miḥna as Self-Defence', *Studia Islamica* 92 (2001), pp. 93-111; for the origins of the debate see, W. Madelung, 'The Origins of the Controversy Concerning the Creation of the Koran', in his, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam* (London, 1985), ch. V.

³⁷ J. Nawas, *Al-Ma'mūn, the inquisition, and the quest for caliphal authority*.

³⁸ J. Nawas, 'Miḥna Revisited', pp.706-8.

under instruction of the chief judge, in attempts to get public recantations. In Egypt, Ibn Abī al-Layth had religious formulas expounding ‘createdness’ doctrine inscribed on the mosques, and had the leading Egyptian Mālikī and Shāfi‘ī jurists who resisted whipped in the congregational mosque.³⁹ Ahmed El Shamsy has demonstrated that there was a markedly sectarian aspect to the *miḥna* in Egypt: praise poems written to Ibn Abī al-Layth celebrate that he ‘smashed the teaching of al-Shāfi‘ī and his followers’, and ‘extinguished their [the Mālikīs] fame so that they are no longer remembered’.⁴⁰ Al-Kindī records that during this period all Mālikī and Shāfi‘ī jurists were banned from even entering the congregational mosque, the centre of Islamic life and politics.⁴¹ Ultimately, the ‘*ulamā*’ emerged victorious in this struggle. Al-Mutawakkil called off the *miḥna* in 851/234, and the show-trials became the basis for hagiographical narratives making the ‘*ulamā*’ martyr-like defenders of religious truth in the face of innovation, and the heroes of the newly emerging Sunnī religious orthodoxy.

Having traced the outlines of ‘Abbāsīd history in Egypt, we are now in a position to understand the place of our author within it. This investigation is the final step we need to take before we are ready to approach the text of FM.

The Banū ‘Abd al-Hakam

³⁹ El Shamsy, *Canonization*, p. 128-9, based on material from KWQ 451-3 and Abū al-‘Arab, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Tamīmī, *al-Miḥan* (Riyad, 1984), pp. 449, 469.

⁴⁰ Ibid, pp. 128-9.

⁴¹ KWQ 451.

The full name of the author of FM was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, generally abbreviated to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by medieval Arabic biographers and modern scholarship. I will retain this convention, though the reader should be careful in secondary works to distinguish him from his father and brothers, all confusingly known to scholarship as Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. In this dissertation I will refer to him as Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and his father and brothers by their first names. He was born in al-Fuṣṭāṭ around 800, and died in 257/871, one of four brothers born to ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.⁴² His history is best told through that of his family, the Banū ‘Abd al Ḥakam, which received reasonable biographical attention in the medieval Islamic tradition, well collected by Brockopp in his *Early Mālikī Law*.⁴³ The family moved to Alexandria and apparently made their wealth there in the time of the author’s great-grandfather A‘yan (d.749), and were linked to the Umayyads by the patronage-tie of *walā’*, claiming an ancestor to have converted to Islam at the hands of the third rightly-guided caliph ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān.⁴⁴

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 829), the author’s father, was a legal scholar who studied under the great Egyptian *muḥaddiths* Ibn Lahī‘a (d. 790) and al-Layth b. Sa‘d (d. 791) in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, who are the indirect informants for much of FM’s historical information about Egypt, as well as Mālik b. Anas (d. 795) in Medina, who was one of the four scholars who would later

⁴² F. Rosenthal, ‘Ibn ‘Abdal-Ḥakam’, EI2.

⁴³ J.B Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and his Major Compendium of Jurisprudence* (Leiden, 2000), pp.1-48; see also C. Torrey, *Conquest of Egypt*, pp. 1-7.

⁴⁴ J. Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law*, p. 14.

be established as founders of the *Sunnī* legal schools.⁴⁵ On returning from the Ḥijāz, Abd ‘Allāh lived in the capital, al-Fuṣṭāṭ, and became associated with the three most famous followers of Mālik in Egypt, Ibn al-Qāsim (d. 806), Ibn Wahb (d. 812), and Ashhab b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 820). He later became closely involved with al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 820), another of the four eponymous ‘founders’ of the *Sunnī* legal schools, all of whose wills he was chosen to execute.⁴⁶ The biographical dictionaries tell us he succeeded Ashhab as the head of the nascent Mālikī school in Egypt, wrote highly ambitious and innovative legal works, some of which are extant, and served as an advisor and witness-inspector (*ṣāhib al-masā’il*) for the chief judge in the three years before his death.⁴⁷ Amongst his immediate followers and throughout ninth-century al-Andalus ‘Abd Allāh seems to have been viewed as a legal authority of equal standing with Mālik himself.⁴⁸ As such, he was one of the most important jurists in Egypt of his time. Our author, his son, thus grew up amidst the most elite intellectual circles in Egypt, if not the caliphate, being taught by the most famous followers of Mālik, as well as al-Shāfi‘ī himself and the far-from-lightweight figure of his father. As such he is clearly well-placed to give us an impression of the attitudes towards the past held by such elites.

⁴⁵ Ibid, pp.14-17.

⁴⁶ Ibid, pp. 17-33. The *ṣāhib al-masā’il*, a position established in Egypt in the later second/eighth century, was appointed by the chief judge to verify the credibility of witnesses to give legal testimony. They seem to have established a limited register of people whose testimony was admissible in court, and been the effective right-hand of the judge. On this development see El Shamsy, *Canonization*, pp. 105-7.

⁴⁷ Ibid, pp. 18-22. His headship of the Mālikī school is a retrospective designation: there would have been no such formally instituted position at the time.

⁴⁸ J. Brockopp, ‘The *Minor Compendium* of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 214/829) and its reception in the early Mālikī school’, *Islamic Law and Society* 12 (2005), p.175.

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, our author’s brother, was particularly associated with al-Shāfi‘ī, whose new legal method was arguably the foundation of classical Islamic law. When al-Shāfi‘ī came to Egypt in 814 he stayed with the Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, is reported as having borrowed substantial sums of money from ‘Abd Allah, and on his death in 820 was buried in the mausoleum of the Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. ‘Abd Allāh recognised the significance of al-Shāfi‘ī’s teachings and encouraged Muḥammad to study with al-Shāfi‘ī, apparently scandalising more traditional devotees of Mālik, and on al-Shāfi‘ī’s death Muḥammad was one of three scholars in the running for the position of heir to al-Shāfi‘ī’s teaching-circle.⁴⁹ Thus, we can conclude that the Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam were central figures amongst the followers of Mālik, and receptive to the legal developments being forwarded by al-Shāfi‘ī which were of such importance to the proto-Sunnī movement. As such, they would seem to be the prime constituency for the hostility shown to Mālikīs and Shāfi‘īs under the judgeship of Ibn Abī al-Layth. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that Muḥammad was one of the jurists who resisted the caliph-enforced ‘createdness’ doctrine and was chosen by Ibn Abī al-Layth for exemplary flogging in the central mosque.⁵⁰ Our author’s integration into this school is not made clear by the biographical dictionaries, but is confirmed by inspection of FM. The common feature of the direct authorities he cites in his *isnāds* is their education under Mālik, al-Layth, and Ibn Lahī‘a.⁵¹ As such, it is almost certain that our author would have been part of the traditional Mālikī grouping in Egypt whose authority was being

⁴⁹ A.El Shamsy, ‘Tradition to Law’, pp.119-21.

⁵⁰ Abū -l-‘Arab, *al-Miḥan*, pp. 449, 469.

⁵¹ e.g. ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama b. Yazīd al-Lūbī, IY 326; ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, IY 338; Hishām b. Ishāq, IY 499; Yaḥyā b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Bukayr, IY 507.

undermined by caliphal policy from the time of the brutal re-integration of Egypt into the caliphate by al-Ma'mūn in 811-2, when Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam would have been in his early thirties.

Ahmed El Shamsy has demonstrated that the Egyptian Mālikīs were the heirs to an Egyptian juristic tradition whose legal hermeneutics were based on local Muslim consensus and continuity of communal practice from the time of Muḥammad and the conquests. This, he suggests, was a system of religio-legal thought which fitted symbiotically with the traditional power structure in Egypt where power was held by aristocratic families whose authority was derived from their descent from heroes of the conquest era.⁵² Thus, he links the processes of the disenfranchisement of the traditional Arab aristocratic elite by the new 'Abbāsīd order with the 'Abbāsīd imposition of Ḥanafism and attacks on Mālikism. Given this interpretation, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's act of writing a history of Egypt which celebrated the original Arab conquest of Egypt would make sense as an encomium of the event which was the source of the legitimacy of the traditional Egyptian elites, produced in the face of these elites' exclusion from power.

Context to Text: heroes of the rebellion?

This picture is complicated by the appointment of 'Abd Allāh, our author's father and the head of the nascent Egyptian Mālikī school, as witness-inspector in the judicial regime

⁵² A.El Shamsy, 'Tradition to Law', pp.78-85.

installed by ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir when he reconquered Egypt for al-Ma’mūn in 826/211. The events surrounding ‘Abd Allāh’s tenure in office are complicated to unpick, but reveal how an awareness of the biographical information about our author and his family can be used to deepen our understanding of the inclusion criteria for historical information found in FM. In brief, ‘Abd Allāh’s acceptance of state office under a caliphal regime might seem to scotch the idea of a Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam resistant to the changes in Egyptian politics and society being worked by the extension of direct caliphal authority. However, I would suggest that this was a moment when the caliphal authorities sought the co-operation of what remained of Egypt’s traditional structures of power. Ibn Ṭāhir had reconquered Egypt for al-Ma’mūn with the aid of the northern alliance of Arabs based in the eastern Delta, and was dismantling the Khurāsānī-based regime of Ibn al-Sarī in al-Fuṣṭāṭ.⁵³ The sources make it clear that rather than high-handedly appointing a chief judge of his own choosing, Ibn Ṭāhir allowed the Egyptian ‘ulamā’ to choose a judge from amongst themselves.⁵⁴ I would suggest therefore that ‘Abd Allāh’s appointment here is in line with the Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s affiliation with the traditional Egyptian elite.

Rather than Ibn Ṭāhir it was al-Mu‘taṣim, the caliph’s brother who was appointed as over-governor of Egypt three years later in 829, who decided to systematically remove the

⁵³ M.Dunn, ‘Struggle’, pp.73-7. Kennedy would perhaps not be happy with the Delta Arabs being associated with the ‘traditional’ elite, but the regularity with which al-Jarawī, their leader, appointed members of the Banū Ḥudayj, the most well-established Arab aristocrats of Egypt, to govern Alexandria for him suggests some commonality of interest. For the Alexandrian appointments, see Dunn, pp.58-9, 60-2, 68. It should also be remembered that the traditional *jund*’s reluctance to suppress the Delta Arabs was a major reason for ‘Abbāsīd introduction of eastern troops to Egypt.

⁵⁴ KWQ 433-4.

traditional Arab elite from power in Egypt. On al-Mu‘taṣim’s appointment over Egypt, the Mālikī chief judge whom ‘Abd Allāh assisted was persuaded by his followers to write to al-Ma’mūn asking for al-Mu‘taṣim to be dismissed. Al-Kindī suggests that they feared that al-Mu‘taṣim would institute a harsh regime comparable to that of the former chief judge Ibn Masrūq, an Iraqī Ḥanafī famous for his disdain for Mālikī sensibilities.⁵⁵ At this point al-Mu‘taṣim’s heavy fiscal exactions sparked widespread revolt. When he led his army – the first ‘Abbāsīd army to include Turkish slave-soldiers – to Egypt to suppress it, he imprisoned the judge who had complained about him, as well as ‘Abd Allāh.⁵⁶ The judge was publicly tried, but ‘Abd Allāh died in prison before he could suffer this ordeal.⁵⁷ Al-Mu‘taṣim then appointed a Ḥanafī from Iraq as interim chief judge, whose judgements were so inimical to the Egyptians that the subsequent Mālikī chief judge felt compelled to revoke many of his rulings.⁵⁸ The Egypt-wide rising of Arabs and non-Muslims at this point, which lasted from 829-832, seems to have been a response to the imposition of repressive taxation and this alien regime by al-Mu‘taṣim.⁵⁹ It is likely that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam would have been sympathetic towards this revolt, given that it was against the regime which had just killed his father.

While Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does not explicitly comment on these events, a careful reading of FM strongly suggests that it represents historical traditions of the type which would have

⁵⁵ KWQ 440; for Ibn Masrūq, see A.El Shamsy, ‘Tradition to Law’, pp.104-5.

⁵⁶ Gordon, *Breaking of a thousand swords*, p. 25.

⁵⁷ KWQ 440-1.

⁵⁸ KWQ 441.

⁵⁹ KWQ, 185-94. HP 487-95.

been used to bolster the claims of the Arab aristocrats who led the 829 rebellion against the regime which had deposed and fatally imprisoned his father. The two aristocrats who led the rebellion were named Ibn ‘Ubaydus and Mu‘āwiya b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid.⁶⁰ The former claimed descent from the conquest-era general ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘. The latter claimed descent from Mu‘āwiya b. Ḥudayj, whose descendants had monopolised the position of chief of police through the Umayyad period and into the early ‘Abbāsīd era.⁶¹ Thus, they were scions of the Arab families who, until the increasing centralisation under the ‘Abbāsīds, had been running Egypt since the conquest. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam gave these rebel leaders’ ancestors prominent roles in his narrative. The conquest of North Africa as presented in FM is effectively a heroic epic celebrating ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘, who conquers and converts all before him, driving as far as the Atlantic before dying in battle against the heathen.⁶² FM’s traditions about Mu‘āwiya b. Ḥudayj seem to reflect Ḥudayjī claims to authority in their power-base of Alexandria, the epicentre of Mu‘āwiya b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid’s revolt against al-Mu‘taṣim.⁶³ Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam tells us that it was Mu‘āwiya who was tasked by ‘Amr to report the conquest of Alexandria to the caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, and presents an extended report of how Mu‘āwiya announced the conquest of Egypt publicly in the prophet’s mosque in Medina.⁶⁴ In a later section of FM concerning the settlement of Alexandria it is Mu‘āwiya who suggests to ‘Amr the hilltop location in which the first Muslim settlement is built, including the congregational mosque

⁶⁰ KWQ 190, 191.

⁶¹ H. Kennedy, ‘Egypt as Province’, pp. 66, 76, 83; Dunn, pp. 77-82.

⁶² FM 194-6. Robert Brunschvig first identified this aspect of the text in his article, ‘Ibn Abdelhakam and the Conquest of North Africa’, in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 213-7.

⁶³ He is described as *raʿīs al-jamāʿa* in Alexandria. KWQ 191.

⁶⁴ FM 81.

and the governorial palace.⁶⁵ These two traditions seem likely to have stemmed from an Alexandrian milieu in which the aristocratic power of the Banū Ḥudayj was bolstered by tales of Mu‘āwīya’s exploits, giving them a special connection to Muslim rule in Alexandria and the very halls of power from which it was exercised.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s choice to include these traditions celebrating the exploits of the ancestors of anti-caliphal rebels who were executed by al-Ma’mūn in 832 cannot be considered neutral data. The preceding inspection of the ‘Abbasid context shows us that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was a Mālikī deeply involved with some of the most important scholars in the development of proto-Sunnism, and who resisted caliphal attempts to extend their authority to theological definition during the *miḥna*. Moreover, within Egypt this affiliation would seem to have placed him in a pro-*wujūh* axis deeply disgruntled with their displacement by new military elites in Egypt coming from the eastern reaches of the caliphate. Careful investigation of FM demonstrates that this affiliation informed the way he put together his work in subtle ways, which would be invisible without proper awareness of the context. Therefore, the conclusions we can gain from these insights from investigation of this context should inform the way we think about his history as a whole. In particular, it seems likely that the text functions at least in part as a celebration of the glorious events which legitimated the authority of the traditional Arab-Muslim elite in Egypt. In the context of the third/ninth century, this should probably be seen as a response to the challenge this elite

⁶⁵ FM 130.

had been increasingly unable to resist from the state-backed importation of eastern governors, soldiers, and judges. It is from this basic milieu that FM emerges. This established, we will change focus and move onto an interpretation of certain key thematic concerns of the text.

Chapter Two:

Defining the Copts in the *Conquest of Egypt*

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s opening chapter of FM is titled ‘The will of the Prophet of God, may God bless him and grant him salvation, towards the Copts’.⁶⁶ For three pages, successive *ḥadīths*, referencing scholars of high standing in Egypt such as Ashhab b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Mālik b. Anas, or the author’s father himself in their *isnāds*, report an imperative from Muḥammad to ‘treat the Copts well, for they have a protection and a kinship’ (*istawṣū bi-l-Qibṭ khayran fa-inna lahum dhimmatan wa raḥīman*).⁶⁷ Further reports gloss the kinship as referring to Ishmael’s Coptic mother Hagar, from whom the line of the Arabs was supposed to descend, and have Muḥammad prophesy that the Copts would be helpers of the Muslims and their religion against their enemies. Given its leading position in the text, the *ḥadīth* warrants a close inspection. The presence of prophetic *ḥadīth* in conquest history writing is far from irregular. FM, in accordance with the combining of genres found in much early Islamic history-writing, includes a significant section of prophetic *ḥadīths* reported on the authority of companions associated with Egypt. However, that section is contained at the very end of the book whereas this *ḥadīth* is placed alone, with a few accompanying *ḥadīths* on the same theme, at the opening of the book.⁶⁸ Though the reports of both the pre-Islamic history and Muslim conquest of Egypt which follow this section are presented with *isnāds*, their inclusion is

⁶⁶ FM 2.

⁶⁷ FM 2-4.

⁶⁸ The final section of *ḥadīth* is FM 248-319.

governed by a continuous chronological scheme to which this extended *ḥadīth*-report at the opening of the book does not comply. Therefore, while the report is not generically unique within the text, its positioning is anomalous, suggesting a distinct function from both the later *ḥadīth*-section and the coming chronological narrative. I would suggest that this opening section of *ḥadīth* about the virtues of the Copts is a conscious prefatory device intended to flag an issue of central importance to the text and its author, as well as to shape the reader's approach to the coming narrative.

We are given two reasons why the Copts should be treated well: their possession of 'a protection' (*dhimma*) and 'a kinship' (*raḥim*). Those who should be treating the Copts well are obliquely identified: those who follow the instructions of Muḥammad, i.e. the Muslims. The very notion that the Muslims must be instructed to treat the Copts well implies that they have the option to do otherwise, and therefore that the power in this relationship resides with them. Given the normative force ascribed to the actions and proclamations of Muḥammad by *sunnī* Islam in this period, this *ḥadīth* claims to recount a correct Muslim understanding of the relationship between communities in Egypt, and the correct conduct of Muslims within that relationship. As established in the preceding historical section, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam can be understood as an advocate of the traditional Egyptian political order whose ability to resist the agents of 'Abbāsīd centralisation was crushed in al-Ma'mūn's repression of their final rebellion in 832. This campaign involved the execution of large numbers of 'Coptic' rebels, along with the deportation and enslavement of significant 'Coptic'

populations associated with the rebels.⁶⁹ The legitimacy of these punitive measures was questioned at the time. A contemporary Egyptian Mālikī jurist is reported as ruling that ‘if they rose up against a tyranny (*ẓulm*) which harmed them then neither their blood nor their properties are permissible’. Al-Maʿmūn purportedly responded, ‘You are a stupid goat and Mālik was even worse’.⁷⁰ In light of this context, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s emphasis on the command of Muḥammad that Muslims should treat the Copts well seems to be an indictment of the Muslim credentials of the new ʿAbbāsīd order which sealed its dominion in Egypt with the brutal subjugation of the Copts.

The basic elements of the *ḥadīth* beg several questions for the uninitiated. Who are the Copts? How did they come to have *dhimma*? What is the nature of this *raḥim* and its significance? And why does a particular, religiously-defined community have power over them? Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s history answers these questions, justifying the relationship of power which the *ḥadīth* encapsulates by its explanations of the origins of the Copts’ *dhimma* and *raḥim*, in both the events of the *futūḥ* and the pre-Islamic history of Egypt. Given the foregrounding of *dhimma*, *raḥim*, and the relationship between Muslims and Copts in a prefatory section, I

⁶⁹ HP 1/494-5 tells us that ‘the soldiers destroyed the insurgents and slew them with the sword without sparing any, and plundered them and wrecked and burnt their dwellings, and demolished their churches . . . those of the Bashmurites who remained he carried as prisoners to the city of Baghdad, both men and women’. KWQ 192 confirms the killing of the men and enslavement of the women.

⁷⁰ Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, v. 2, p. 529. Al-Maʿmūn continued that if the Copts had suffered tyranny their proper recourse was to seek redress through himself rather than shed Muslim blood. The jurist, al-Ḥārith b. Miskīn, would be transported to Baghdād for interrogation as part of the *miḥna*, and sent back to Egypt as chief judge by al-Mutawakkil when the *miḥna* was ended. See SAN, 12/54-8; TKIR, 5/281-7; KWQ 467-472.

would suggest that this historical exegesis of the *ḥadīth* is one of the intended functions of the text, and its inspection will be the subject of this section of the dissertation. First, we will look at the polemical presentation of the Egyptians as Christians who fail to accept revelation and obey proper authority, which is contrasted to the obedience of the Arab *muhājirūn*, explaining the supremacy of the latter as a community of God and justifying their conquest of the former. We will then see how the Copts are schematically defined in the text by their *dhimmī* acceptance of submission by treaty to and subsequent aid of the Arabs in the *futūḥ*. We will note that the ‘Roman’ community is contrarily defined by resistance to and forceful defeat by the Arabs, and represented as an alien ruling group whose dominance over Egypt is much like that of the Arabs. Thus, the Copts are dissociated from the Roman foe still harrying the coast of Muslim Egypt in the mid-ninth century, and given a history of co-operation with the Muslims which affords them a positive role in the foundation of Islamic Egypt. Thereby, a workable past is constructed for the Muslims and the ‘indigenous’ population of Egypt. Finally, we will see how pre-Islamic prophetic history is deployed by the text to establish on a universal scale these paradigms presented in the *futūḥ*-narrative, particularly this indigenous status of the Copts and a concrete, quasi-tribal, genealogical distinction between ‘Copts’ and ‘Romans’. Through analysis of the representation of Coptic identity within these sections various polemical mechanisms will be exposed by which narratives of the past were deployed by this ninth-century Muslim author to argue a favoured yet flawed identity for the Copts which ultimately asserted their subservient, minority position.

Of particular importance for representation of the Copts in the conquest narrative is the character of al-Muqawqis, who is presented as the leader of the Romans and Copts in many Arabic texts, including FM. His institutional role is unclear and al-Muqawqis isn't easily read as a transliteration of the name or title of any of the major Roman officials in Egypt at the time of the conquest. Butler suggested the widely accepted solution that we regard al-Muqawqis as Cyrus, the Chalcedonian Patriarch appointed by Heraclius in 631, proposing that the name was some Arabic referent to his origin in the Caucasus.⁷¹ A recent dissertation by Christopher Wright has pointed out that the picture of al-Muqawqis in FM is difficult to square with the Cyrus of other texts, such the seventh century *Chronicle* of John of Nikiou, which present him as a ruthless persecutor of the Copts.⁷² In FM al-Muqawqis negotiates on behalf of the Copts, is described as the 'great one of the Copts' (*ʿaẓīm al-Qibṭ*), and when the emperor refuses to accept his peace-making with the Arabs, approaches ʿAmr asking to make a separate peace for himself and the Copts, one of the conditions of which is that ʿAmr not reconcile with the Romans until they are totally defeated.⁷³ Wright argues that these things would have been unthinkable for Cyrus, that al-Muqawqis was rather an Arabic term for Patriarch, and that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam uses the term indiscriminately to describe different holders of that office. The apparent incongruity of al-Muqawqis' behaviour in *Futuh Miṣr* with that of the 'historical' Cyrus is thus explained by saying that whenever al-Muqawqis appears

⁷¹ A. Butler, *The Arab conquest of Egypt and the last thirty years of the Roman dominion* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 508-26.

⁷² C. Wright, 'Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam's *Futuh Misr*: An Analysis of the Text and New Insights into the Islamic Conquest of Egypt' (University of California Santa Barbara Ph.D. thesis, 2006), pp. 67-92.

⁷³ FM 45-6, 72-3.

negotiating on behalf of the Copts, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is actually relating a tradition about the anti-Chalcedonian Patriarch Benjamin, and has fudged all Patriarchs into one character.

This seems a rational solution at first glance, and may reflect something of the ultimate origins of the traditions, but fails on three counts. Firstly, Wright assumes without comment, as much secondary literature of this period does, that the labels Copt and Roman are used in the text synonymously with anti-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians. While from the early Islamic period the anti-Chalcedonian hierarchy increasingly portrayed itself as a native, ‘Coptic’ church, whether and how their attempts to conflate an indigenous ethnicity and their sectarian identity were taken up by Muslim writers such as Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam requires further study, not blanket assumption.⁷⁴ In this text there is no hint of religious difference between Romans and Copts. Secondly, Wright assumes inherent hostility between ‘Copts’ and ‘Romans’. However, the cultural *romanitas* of anti-Chalcedonian elites has recently been demonstrated from papyrological evidence well into the early Islamic period, showing that there was not necessarily a clear-cut cultural divide between anti-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians.⁷⁵ Were we to believe that these terms are used in FM as sectarian labels, we should also be wary of buying later Coptic-church and Melkite narratives stressing sectarian antagonism for their own reasons. In 633 Cyrus had presided over a successful ecclesiastical

⁷⁴ A.Papaconstantinou, ‘Historiography, Hagiography, and the Making of the Coptic “Church of the Martyrs” in Early Islamic Egypt’, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 60 (2006), pp. 68–81.

⁷⁵ A.Papaconstantinou, ‘“What remains behind”: Hellenism and Romanitas in Christian Egypt after the Arab conquest’, in H. Cotton *et al.* (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (Cambridge, 2009), p.463.

union between Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians using formulae with notable avoidance of Chalcedon, and even after the Arab conquests previously anti-Chalcedonian bishops remained in communion with Constantinople.⁷⁶ In this light we might ask whether Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s more ecumenical al-Muqawqis is closer to the ‘historical’ Cyrus than the demonised al-Muqawqis of sectarian Christian Arabic historiography. Finally, and more importantly when considering the internal arguments of FM, there is no suggestion within the text that al-Muqawqis represents more than one person. At certain points when Wright wishes to make a distinction between al-Muqawqis/Cyrus and al-Muqawqis/Benjamin they are clearly one character in narrative terms. The most explicit is when al-Muqawqis is ordered by Heraclius to renege on the peace which he had made at Babylon and then reported to the emperor, after which he instead immediately goes to ‘Amr to ask him to maintain the peace with himself and the Copts.⁷⁷ To claim that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is consciously talking about two different people here would be perverse. Muslim historians were unusually willing to point out inconsistencies they noted in the narratives they reported, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam makes a point of doing so at various points in his text: we must assume that he saw nothing incongruous here in the actions of al-Muqawqis. Furthermore, the argument that he is conflating Cyrus and Benjamin is weakened by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s inclusion of Benjamin in the text, describing him as a ‘bishop of the Copts . . . at Alexandria’.⁷⁸ Rather than carving

⁷⁶ P.Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and seventh-century heresy: the Synodical letter and other documents : introduction, texts, translations, and commentary* (Oxford, 2009),p.161-3.

⁷⁷ FM 71-2.

⁷⁸ FM 58.

up al-Muqawqis' character to suit our interpretation of conquest-era politics, it is worth inspecting him as he appears, and as we must assume Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam thought about him.

Al-Muqawqis' main role is to provide a mouthpiece for the arguments of the Christian population of Egypt as the Muslim traditions Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam records wished to present them. As noted, *isnād-khabar* history-writing did not allow for much explicit editorial comment, therefore ideas about and interpretations of the historical events described are presented through reported speech. Envoys between the Muslims and their antagonists are the prime method of commenting on differences between communities, a feature shared with much Muslim historiography, such as al-Azdi's *Futūḥ al-Shām*.⁷⁹ In FM al-Muqawqis always negotiates on behalf of the Christians, and as such features in several episodes in which the terse, disjointed *ḥadīth*-style gives way to long discourses between two main characters. With his undefined institutional role as leader of both Romans and Copts, al-Muqawqis' status is not tainted for the Muslims by particular association with the Roman empire, and he can represent all Christians in these debates, no matter what sectarian or ethnic stripe. Thus, the concessions he makes, political and religious, as rightful ruler of his community would appear, from the text, to stand for all Egyptians. This allows the traditions recounted by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam to make particular arguments through al-Muqawqis

⁷⁹ N. Khalek, "He was tall and slender, and his virtues were numerous': Byzantine hagiographical topoi and the companions of Muhammad in al-Azdi's *Futuh al-Sham*", in A. Papaconstantinou (ed.), *Writing 'True Stories'* (Turnhout, 2010), pp.120-2.

confirming Muḥammad's prophethood, justifying the invasion of Egypt, and explaining why Christians should but don't recognise Islam as the true faith, amongst various other things.

A brief inspection of al-Muqawqis' first appearance in the text should serve to illustrate some of this. In the sixth year after the *hijra* Muḥammad sends him an envoy summoning him to Islam. He challenges the Muslim envoy, and asks him about Islam and the practice of Muḥammad. The envoy leaves out certain elements of Muḥammad's appearance, which al-Muqawqis then correctly completes for him before saying 'I knew already that a prophet remained, and assumed that he would come from Syria, for the prophets before him came from there, but I see that he has emerged amongst the Arabs'.⁸⁰ Al-Muqawqis then declares that 'the Copts will not obey me in following him, and I do not want them to be told of my conversing with you', but prophesies that 'his companions after him will be victorious over the countries and take up quarters in our unoccupied area'.⁸¹ He then sends Muḥammad gifts, including two young women of 'great standing amongst the Copts', one of whom, Maria, Muḥammad takes as his concubine.⁸² The recognition of Islam by the leader of the Egyptian Christians through gift-giving while foretelling the future rule of the Muslims is a clear inter-confessional polemical point, whereby Christian refusal to accept the truth of Islam justifies their subjugation by force, one which perhaps models a Muslim understanding of *dhimmī* recognition of Islam through payment of the *jizya*. This episode also firmly integrates Egypt

⁸⁰ FM 47.

⁸¹ FM 47.

⁸² FM 48. The woman are described as *jāriyas*. On *Māriya*, EI2, 'Māriya', with bibliography.

into the prophetic age of Islam, with Muḥammad's envoy becoming the opening act of the Muslim conquest of Egypt, perhaps smoothing over the infamously deceitful way in which ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ is supposed to have begun the invasion against the will of the caliph ʿUmar, which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam records on pages 55-58. On Muḥammad's death, Abū Bakr dispatches the same envoy to al-Muqawqis, and a treaty is apparently made.⁸³ Muslim historiography presents Abū Bakr at this time as renewing the alliances and submissions which Muḥammad had established, and thereby the appearance of Egypt here could suggest that Egypt was already in some state of submission to the *umma* in the time of the prophet.

Al-Muqawqis' most obvious function here is to play the Baḥīrā-role of the Christian religious-figure and visionary who recognises Muḥammad's prophethood, thereby demonstrating the truth of Islam through figures which Christian discourse had long established as being able to, as Sizgorich puts it, 'discern more profound realities'.⁸⁴ Muḥammad as described by his envoy fulfils al-Muqawqis' pre-revealed vision of a final prophet to come, 'whose description and distinguishing mark we found in the book of God', through elements of Muḥammad's practice and appearance which al-Muqawqis recognises from his questioning, and through Muḥammad's correct responses to the gifts which al-Muqawqis sends, which correspond to al-Muqawqis' supposed vision.⁸⁵ Muḥammad's position as culmination of the succession of monotheistic prophets is a continual theme in the exchange. His envoy asks al-Muqawqis,

⁸³ FM 53.

⁸⁴ T. Sizgorich, 'Narrative and Community in Islamic Late Antiquity', *Past and Present* 185 (2004), p. 27.

⁸⁵ FM 48.

‘What is Moses’ prophecy of Jesus but the like of Jesus’ prophesy of Muḥammad? And what is our calling you to the *Qu’rān* but the like of your calling the people of the Torah to the Gospel?’.⁸⁶ The dispatch of the envoy, one of four sent to Constantinople, Persia, Oman, and Egypt, is compared explicitly by Muḥammad to Jesus dispatching his disciples to evangelise the earth.⁸⁷ Finally, al-Muqawqis’ recognition of Muḥammad’s prophethood through sending the gift of a young woman echoes Pharaoh’s gift of the Hagar to Abraham on Pharaoh’s recognition of the power which Abraham and Sarah’s God had over him (as recounted in Islamic tradition), the tale of which would be fresh in the reader’s mind from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s recounting of it earlier.⁸⁸ This act was, of course, the foundation of the *raḥim* between the Arabs and the Copts so stressed at the beginning of FM in association with the injunction for the Arabs to treat the Copts well. Therefore al-Muqawqis’ gift-giving casts Muḥammad as Abraham in a narrative reaffirmation of the genealogical link between Copts and Arabs, brought about by submission of Egyptian non-Muslim authority (Pharaoh/al-Muqawqis) to Muslim truth enacted through sexual union between a prophet and a Coptic woman bestowed as a gift. Thereby, the opening engagement of the Muslims with Egypt is integrated into a universal scheme of the bearers of revelation acting upon Egypt. The parallelism is neatly rounded off by the name of Muḥammad and Maria’s son: Abraham.

⁸⁶ FM 46.

⁸⁷ FM 45.

⁸⁸ FM 10-2. Hagar’s status is not made explicit in FM, though al-Ṭabarī describes her as a *jāriya*, like Māriya: TT 1/245.

Muḥammad's prophethood is thus established and the Christian leader of Egypt accepts it: a reason why the Romans and Copts do not flock to Islam is required. Al-Muqawqis tersely states 'the Copts will not obey me in following him [Muḥammad]', but a fuller explanation can be gleaned from the context of the exchange.⁸⁹ When Muḥammad dispatches his envoys, he tells the story of Jesus dispatching his disciples to evangelise the earth, when apparently the disciples resisted his command because they couldn't speak foreign languages. Jesus despairs and God must intervene, granting the disciples the gift of tongues. Thus a Christian miracle-story is reinterpreted as a tale of Christian disobedience, a strategy surely echoing contemporary inter-confessional polemic and debate, and the Muslims are warned not to follow this example. The *muhājirūn* prove their superiority as a community of God through their contrasting response to his commands as mediated through their prophet, crying, 'Oh messenger of God, by God we will never dispute with you about anything. Command us! Send us!'.⁹⁰ We have already noted how Muḥammad's actions are integrated into a Judaeo-Christian prophetic scheme, and that Muḥammad is said to be the fulfilment of biblical prophecies. The unity of the religion of the monotheistic prophets is now unambiguously stated by the envoy to al-Muqawqis: 'We do not forbid the religion of Christ, rather we order you to it'.⁹¹ Thus the difference between the Arabs and their Christian and Jewish predecessors is not necessarily in the virtue of their prophets, but in their community's receptivity to revealed truth. The Christians are categorised as a community which does not

⁸⁹ FM 47.

⁹⁰ FM 45.

⁹¹ FM 46.

properly accept this truth, and thus integrated into Judaeo-Christian narratives of chosen communities falling from the right path, also a particular Koranic obsession.⁹²

This theme of Christian waywardness, established at the very beginning of the conquest narrative, from the mouth of the prophet himself, is consolidated throughout the narration of the conquest of Egypt. Al-Muqawqis, having foreseen the inevitability of their conquest, privately urges the Copts and Romans to submit to the Arabs even while negotiating on their behalf: 'If you do not accept it [ʿAmr's call for them to either convert, accept *dhimmī* status and pay *jizya*, or fight] submissively then you will [ultimately] accept of them that which is more detestable to you'.⁹³ Though apparently leader of the Copts and Romans, his power to command them is presented as limited: they reject his advice, fight and are massacred. As al-Muqawqis tells ʿAmr, 'Those Romans and Copts who were with me refused [my eagerness to accept your terms]. It was not for me to exercise authority upon them regarding their wealth [i.e. payment of *jizya*]'.⁹⁴ In the disastrous results of the Christians' refusal to follow the counsel of al-Muqawqis, presented in the text as their rightful leader, the critique of Christian disobedience, as contrasted to Muslim acceptance of right guidance, is reinforced through association with the contrasting, providentially-directed, fates of the Christians and Muslims during the *futūḥ*.⁹⁵

⁹² R. Humphreys, 'Qur'ānic Myth and Narrative Structure in Early Islamic Historiography', in F. Clover and R. Humphreys, *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity* (Wisconsin, 1989), pp. 277-8.

⁹³ FM 69.

⁹⁴ FM 69.

⁹⁵ FM 65-72.

Thus far, both Romans and Copts have been treated identically, commonly criticised for their Christian failure to rightly receive revelation. However, at this point in the narrative their conduct becomes distinct. Al-Muqawqis points out to the survivors the result of their failure to heed his warning and tells them to ‘obey me before you regret it’, which they do, agreeing to pay the *jizya*.⁹⁶ However, while it was clearly stated before Babylon that both Romans and Copts were involved in the negotiations, in the treaties recounted the identifying term used is Copt – ‘all of this was stipulated on the Copts especially’ – though the usual conquest-treaty clause is added that those Romans who wish to make peace and stay may do so on the same terms.⁹⁷ Al-Muqawqis then writes to Heraclius informing him of these developments and trying to gain his acceptance of the treaty. Heraclius, however, is outraged and, as al-Muqawqis then reports to ‘Amr, orders the Romans to reject ‘Amr’s peace-terms and ‘fight you until they vanquish you or you vanquish them’.⁹⁸

At this point al-Muqawqis refuses to renege on the peace he has made with ‘Amr, with the narrative once more taking up the theme of the failure of the Christians to accept al-Muqawqis’ understanding of the Muslims’ inevitable victory, ending with him telling the Romans, ‘tomorrow, you will turn back to my opinion and speech, and you would ask for protection if you were obedient to me and that which I have seen and have beheld and known,

⁹⁶ FM 69-70.

⁹⁷ FM 70.

⁹⁸ FM 72.

that which the king [Heraclius] has not seen, or beheld or known'.⁹⁹ It is at this point that al-

Muqawqis goes to 'Amr and the break between Copts and Romans occurs, al-Muqawqis telling

'Amr:

'I have not broken the terms which I entered into and by which I made compact (*āhadtuka*) with you, but my authority is over only myself and those who obey me. The treaty (*ṣulḥ*) of the Copts is complete according to the terms you and they agreed and no breach has come on their account. I confirm [it] to you for myself and they confirm to you the treaty which you made and compacted with them. As for the Romans, I am quit (*barīʿ*) of them, and I request that you grant me three things.' 'Amr said to him, 'Go on.' He said, '[Firstly,] do not abolish [your treaty] with the Copts. Consider me one of them and impose on me the same obligations as are required of them (*adkhlīnī maʿahum wa-alzimnī mā lazimahum*). Already my word and theirs are in agreement upon the terms by which I made compact with you, and they confirm it to you according to your will.'¹⁰⁰

Thus al-Muqawqis makes a separate peace for himself and the 'Copts' while the 'Romans' continue to fight. Furthermore, his second request is that 'Amr not make treaty with the Romans, rather make them slaves and common property (*fay'*) for the Muslims. 'Amr accepts his entreaty. A shorter, alternative account places these events at Alexandria, but relays the negotiations similarly, down to al-Muqawqis' three requests.¹⁰¹ The remainder of the conquest-history narrates a drive to Alexandria, with the Romans now exclusively the enemies, and with Copts present amongst the Muslim forces, aiding the Muslims by working on roads and bridges, and supplying the invaders with food and fodder. Thus, 'the Copts became helpers (*aʿwān*) to them in whatever they desired in fighting the Romans', fulfilling the prophetic *ḥadīth* at the beginning of the book that the Muslims would 'find them excellent

⁹⁹ FM 71.

¹⁰⁰ FM 72.

¹⁰¹ FM 72.

helpers (*āwān*) in fighting your enemies' as part of the reasoning behind treating the Copts well.¹⁰²

This kind of narration has historically been read to suggest that the anti-Chalcedonians of the Roman empire welcomed the invaders with open arms, throwing off the oppression of their Chalcedonian Roman (generally anachronistically glossed as Melkite) persecutors. Thus we learn in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* that 'the Copts wanted a change of masters at any cost'.¹⁰³ However, we have already noted that it is not obvious that 'Copt' signifies anti-Chalcedonian in this text. Furthermore, as Jones pointed out as early as 1959, the earliest narrative we have of the conquest, by the anti-Chalcedonian John of Nikiou who was writing at the end of the seventh century, presents a confused and uncertain response to the invaders on behalf of the Egyptians, rather than general welcome, and is certainly not a history of a Coptic/anti-Chalcedonian regionalist movement throwing off their Roman oppressor.¹⁰⁴ While the 'heresy' of the emperor provides John's providential causation for the success of the Muslims, it does not lead the anti-Chalcedonians to aid the invader. Rather, those who join the Muslim army are identified as 'the Egyptians who had apostatised from the Christian faith and embraced the faith of the beast'.¹⁰⁵ If there had been a particular association of 'Copts',

¹⁰² FM 3,73-4.

¹⁰³ A. Atiya, 'Kibṭ', EI2.

¹⁰⁴ A. Jones, 'Were ancient heresies national or social movements in disguise?', *Journal of Theological Studies* X (1959), p.289.

¹⁰⁵ John of Nikiu, *Chronicle*, ed. R. Charles, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu: translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text* (London, 1916), cxiv.1, p.182.

understood either ethnically as ‘native’ Egyptians or religiously as anti-Chalcedonians, with collaboration in John’s time, it would be strange for him to castigate it so harshly.

Despite its problematic transmission and defective current translation, an inspection of John’s *Chronicle* is useful in determining the aims of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s narration. John recounts a campaign which involves various expeditions to named cities, with different groups of Muslim forces attacking targets successfully and unsuccessfully, and strategic difficulties for the Muslims in linking up these various forces. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s account rather depicts a unitary Muslim force, with occasional reference to groups of outriders, advancing through a few, often unnamed villages until it reaches Babylon, gains victory, and then continues to Alexandria in the same manner, which then falls. John’s account, difficult as it may be to piece together, clearly attempts to realistically describe the confused and contingent expediencies of a campaign on several fronts, the key features of which were remembered. Providential causation underpins but does not obliterate details of the conquest. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s account does not appear to be able to recover these ‘realistic’ details, or is uninterested in doing so. The treatment is far more polemical, with more focus on the conquest as an opportunity to characterise particular individuals or communities through their conduct in the campaign. The contrasting treatment of infrastructural work done by Egyptians in aid of the Muslims should illustrate this. John tells us:

Amr sent Abākīrī of the city of Dalās requesting him to bring the ships of Rīf in order to transport to the east bank of the river the Ishmaelites who were upon the west . . . And he sent orders to the prefect George to construct for him a bridge on the river of the city Qaljūb with a view to the capture of all the cities of Mīsr . . . And he had moreover a great bridge constructed over the river near

Babylon in Egypt to prevent the passage of ships to Nakius, Alexandria, and upper Egypt, and to make it possible for horses to cross from the western to the eastern bank of the river.¹⁰⁶

‘Amr orders requisitions from particular cities or officials to undertake these works, and an explanation of their strategic significance is included. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam simply reports, ‘they [the leaders of the Copts] repaired the roads and [possibly: re-]erected the bridges and markets for them [the Muslims]’.¹⁰⁷ In Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time Muslim tradition had obviously retained memories of Egyptian infrastructural co-operation (or perhaps, co-optation), but remembering its particular strategic context was no longer useful and therefore these had been discarded: its significance now lay in its demonstration of the pro-Muslim conduct of the ‘Copts’ as opposed to the Romans. Ultimately, the presentation of Copts versus Romans in the conquest must be regarded as schematic, rather than descriptive: the Copts are those who submit to the Muslims by treaty and subsequently aid them, the Romans are those who fight and have to be conquered by force (*‘anwatan*).

This is most plainly shown by the general refusal of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to use the term Copt to describe any population subjugated by force. We have noted that after the surrender at Babylon, those who enter *dhimmī* status are repeatedly described as Copts.¹⁰⁸ After Alexandria is taken by force, however, in the recounting of the population and booty captured those who are not classed as Romans or Jews are numbered but given no signifier beyond ‘captives’

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, cviii.1-3, pp. 181-2.

¹⁰⁷ FM, p. 73.

¹⁰⁸ FM 70.

(*asārā*).¹⁰⁹ During the conquest the people of three ‘villages’ are said to have fought in a troop in support of the Romans against the Muslims and been conquered by force. When ‘Umar makes a decision that they should not be considered booty but left to pay the *kharāj*, despite the fact that they are clearly non-Roman they are classified as distinct from the ‘Copts’: ‘their *kharāj* and that which the Copts settled for are a force for the Muslims against their enemies’.¹¹⁰ At this point we might also return to the passage quoted above, in which al-Muqawqis asks for a separate peace for the Copts. In this, having declared himself ‘quit’ (*barī*) of the Romans, his first condition is that ‘Amr maintain the peace with the Copts and ‘consider me one of them and impose on me the same obligations as are required of them’ (*adkhlīnī ma‘ahum wa alzimnī mā lazimahum*).¹¹¹ Peace with the Muslims is synonymous with association with the ‘Copts’ and disassociation from the Romans. On the same page (though not, it must be said, in the same *khavar*), al-Muqawqis is described as ‘the Roman’ (*al-rūmī*): it almost appears as if al-Muqawqis’ request models the process in the text whereby a Muslim authority defines the identity, presented in ethnic terms, of conquest-era Egyptians by their political response to the invading Muslims. Identification with the ‘Copts’ becomes a means by which perhaps even ‘Romans’, such as those choosing to stay and accept the terms imposed on the Copts as allowed in the described peace treaty, could attain non-Roman, and thus non-hostile status. This is how the question of who is a Copt and who a Roman is

¹⁰⁹ FM 82.

¹¹⁰ FM 83, 88.

¹¹¹ FM 72.

answered by the conquest narrative, thus developing the association of the Copts with *dhimma* in the opening *ḥadīth* to become an intrinsic basis for an ‘ethnic’ community.¹¹²

It should be noted that an exception to the usages described above is the short section entitled ‘Those who said Egypt was conquered by force’, in which several *ḥadīths* are recounted which imply that there was no treaty with the Copts, and they therefore didn’t have *dhimma*.¹¹³ However, given that ‘Abd al-Ḥakam includes a longer section devoted to ‘Those who said Egypt was conquered by treaty’, and his historical/chronologically-ordered narrative never reports a scenario in which the Copts are conquered by force, it would seem that his presentation is weighted to support the view that Egypt was conquered by treaty except for Alexandria and the three villages.¹¹⁴ In fact the restriction of these comments to a separate section with no parallel elsewhere in the text suggests that the views presented in it are considered anomalous, particularly in light of the prefatory three pages of *ḥadīths* asserting the Copts’ *dhimma* which was the starting-point of this study.

While we have seen that, practically, Coptic identity in the conquest narrative is indistinguishable from political accommodation with the Muslims, acceptance of *dhimma* status and payment of the *jizya*, the text does not explicitly define the Coptic community as

¹¹² I do not suggest that this is a realistic description of how ethnic identities developed in the conquest period, merely the internal logic of representation of non-Muslim Egyptian ethnicity in *Futūḥ Miṣr*.

¹¹³ FM 88-90.

¹¹⁴ FM 84-8.

originating from that political moment. To understand how the text presents the origins of the Copts we must investigate the second arm of the opening *ḥadīth*, the Copts' *raḥim*, or kinship.

As with most early Islamic conceptions of ethnicity, the Copts are said to have descended from a common ancestor. Often eponymous with the community they are supposed to have begotten, the status and relations of these ancestors was both 'Islam's traditional way of sketching interdependence between the different ethnicities of the faith along the lines of family relations', and also a means of making arguments of superiority or inferiority about different races.¹¹⁵ Thus, Persian claims of descent from Isaac both gave them a link to the Arabs' supposed common ancestor Ishmael, but also led to *shu'ūbī* Persian assertions of superiority for being descended from the wife rather than the concubine, and Arab claims that Ishmael was the son selected for the sacrifice, making the Arabs descended from the more significant brother.¹¹⁶ We have already seen how the Copts' *raḥim* fits into this particular episode, with Hagar presented as a Copt and mother of the Arabs, and how this episode is explored by the text and paralleled by Muḥammad's relationship with Maria the Copt. This is obviously a means of giving the Copts a privileged relationship with the Arabs, a theme taken up in the second non-narrative, introductory section of the book, 'Some of the merits of Egypt', which is largely concerned with the virtues of the Copts:

¹¹⁵ S. Bashear, *Arabs and Others in Early Islam* (Princeton, 1997), pp. 67-8 .

¹¹⁶ A. Shboul, *Al-Mas'ūdī & his world : a Muslim humanist and his interest in non-Muslims* (London, 1979), pp.108-9.

the Copts of Egypt are the noblest of all the foreigners (*akram al-a'ājim*), the most openhanded and generous of them (*asmaḥuhum yadan*), the best of them in terms of race (*aḡḡaluhum 'unṣuran*), and the closest of them in terms of kinship (*aqrabuhum raḡiman*) to the Arabs in general and to the Quraysh in particular.¹¹⁷

This, however, is not the only exploration of the Copts' *raḡim* in the pre-Islamic section. To discover the original genealogical divergence between the Copts, Romans and Arabs, we must delve deeper into pre-Islamic sacred history, to the sons of Noah. This is recounted in the first narrative chapter of the book, entitled 'The Copts' arrival in Egypt and residence therein'.¹¹⁸ This establishes that the father of all the Copts is Bayṣar son of Ham, thus making the Copts, along with the Sudanese, Ethiopians, Sindīs, Indians and Berbers, of the line of Ham, son of Noah. The different fates of the lineages of the sons of Noah are explained in this account as a result of these sons' responses when Noah, having asked God to bless his progeny, calls them to receive their blessing.¹¹⁹ First he calls Shem, who comes with one of his sons: they are given 'the best blessing', and kingship and prophethood are invested by God in the progeny of Shem's son Arpachshad. When Ham is called, however, neither he nor his progeny respond, leading Noah to invoke God to curse them that Ham's progeny be made submissive, and slaves of the progeny of Shem. Things aren't looking good for the Copts, but then we are told that actually Miṣr (i.e. 'Egypt'), son of Bayṣar and thus grandson of Ham, does hear the call and goes to Noah, asking him to make a request for him in his prayer, and Noah entreats God to:

¹¹⁷ FM 5.

¹¹⁸ FM 7-10.

¹¹⁹ In contrast to the biblical account, in which it is the sons' different responses to finding Noah drunk and naked in his tent results in the servitude of the sons of Ham. Gen 9:20-7.

bless him [Miṣr] and his descendants, and settle him in the blessed land that is the mother of lands, and the succour of humanity, whose river is the best of the world's rivers, create in it the best blessings, make the land serviceable for him and his progeny, subdue it for them, and consolidate them in it.¹²⁰

Thus, Miṣr brings his father and his brothers to Egypt, settles it, and divides the land amongst his four sons, one of whom is Qibṭ [i.e. Copt], and who succeed Miṣr as possessors of Egypt, then followed by their progeny. Thus, through the actions of Miṣr, the curse of Ham is ameliorated and Miṣr's strand of the genealogy of the Copts is blessed with possession of Egypt. Kingship and prophethood, however, remain in the genealogy of Shem, whose descendants, we are told, are the Arabs, the Persians and the Romans.

This is borne out in Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's section on Roman rule in Egypt, where the people of Egypt are said to have made peace with the Romans on the condition that they pay a certain amount, and the Romans give them *dhimma*.¹²¹ Thus, Roman rule is presented in the same terms as Arab-Muslim rule, and the Muslim conquests are woven into another universal scheme, that of the rule of the Copts by the children of Shem, the races with inherently dominant status: Arabs, Persians, and Romans. This genealogical/historical scheme has the further benefit of asserting the absolute distinction between Copts and Romans, and presenting the Romans as alien incomers who ruled over the Copts in the same way the Arab-Muslims do. In this version of history there can be no Egyptian nostalgia for the Roman

¹²⁰ FM 8.

¹²¹ FM 33-5.

empire: between Late Antiquity and Early Islam there is only the continuity of Copts ruled, justifiably, by an alien race.

Effectively, this episode of pre-Islamic sacred history establishes the essential paradigms by which Coptic identity is expounded in the later sections, to prepare the ground for those arguments. The Copts, as part of the genealogy of Ham, are excluded from the full favour of God through an act of disobedience on the part of their progenitor in the face of revelation: he fails to respond to a prophet's call to receive the blessing of God, as al-Muqawqis will later tell us the Copts will heed his call to accept Muḥammad as the last prophet. However, despite this failure, the actions of Miṣr salvage a place for the Copts in God's benediction, much as the Copts' acceptance of Muslim rule after the siege of Babylon gains them a protected, *dhimmī* status in Islamic Egypt, despite their earlier resistance. Further, the divine decree allotting the land of Egypt to Miṣr's descendents gives broader justification to the notion that the Copts have the right of security in their property, as asserted by those *ḥadīths* and *akhbār* which say that they have *dhimma*. Yet ultimately all these features of *dhimma* and *raḥim* which give the Copts a favoured position in Egypt fuse Coptic identity with subservient, minority status. The conquest-narrative totally aligns Coptic identity with acceptance of Muslim rule and *dhimmī* status, while the genealogical origins of the Copts are with the progeny of Ham who are made submissive (*adhillā'*) by divine decree. While their possession of Egypt is protected, the sin of disobedience justifies the rule over them by other peoples who responded to the call of revelation.

Therefore the status of the Copts as presented by the events of the conquest is integrated into a divinely-ordained, universal scheme, whereby the Muslim conquests reaffirm and in turn have their righteousness confirmed by, pre-Islamic prophetic history. This clearly demonstrates Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s ability to use different types of material (prophetic *ḥadīth*, pre-Islamic sacred history, accounts of the Muslim conquest) to support particular ideas, and the importance of reading FM as a whole in which arguments presented in particular sections of the work contribute to the effects of other sections and the reader’s understanding of their significance. In practical terms, we see that reading Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s use of the term Copt in the modern understanding of the term, as members of the anti-Chalcedonian church of Egypt, is a mistake. Rather, Copt is used as an ethnic term to define an indigenous Egyptian population contrasted to ‘Romans’ who are constructed as an essentially military and alien force of occupation, in a strategy designed to create a suitable non-hostile place for the non-Muslim population of Egypt in the foundation-moment of Islamic Egypt. This may have been a useful conceit for the ‘Coptic’ church to capitalise on in its self-definition as a nativist church, but readings which use FM to argue for anti-Chalcedonian rejection of Roman rule are buying into a schematic conquest narrative which originally had little to do with ‘Copts’ and ‘Melkites’ as we now understand them. As such, I would prefer to read the term Copt at least in FM as a neutral label in sectarian terms, rather signifying a Muslim idea of an autochthonous population of Egypt. Finally, the stress placed on the Muslim obligation to treat the Copts well in the text may well be a further marker suggesting that FM functions as a text supporting the traditional Arab-Muslim Egyptian power-structures which were being displaced, by offering an implicit but damning critique of the agents of al-Ma’mūn and al-

Mu‘taşim who so brutally suppressed the Coptic element of the large-scale rebellion of 831-2, thereby suggesting they broke Muḥammad’s covenant governing right Muslim conduct in Egypt and as such are an illegitimate Muslim authority.

Chapter Three:

Roles and functions of pre-Islamic history

The preceding investigation of the origins of the Copts in FM has demonstrated that in that case pre-Islamic history seems not to have been randomly appended to the story of the conquests, but deliberately selected to integrate arguments made within that narrative into more universal structures. As such, the next step of our exploration will be to scrutinise other aspects of the pre-Islamic narrative which fronts the text and attempt to consider some of the purposes behind the devotion of the first fifteen percent of a book purporting to be about the Muslim conquests to pre-Islamic history.¹²² This section, identified by Michael Cook as the first surviving version of the ‘traditionist history’ of pre-Islamic Egypt, has not to my knowledge been analysed in and of itself.¹²³ Cook briefly noted its features as part of his 1983 article on Pharaonic history, but his central concern was rather how much the so-called ‘Hermetic’ history of pre-Islamic Egypt, which he dated to the early fifth/eleventh century, included Coptic elements of national history.¹²⁴ The main other investigation of Islamic stories about pre-Islamic Egypt is that of Ulrich Haarmann in an article from 1980 commenting on the nature of ‘Regional Sentiment in Medieval Islamic Egypt’.¹²⁵ Haarmann’s article, while making some interesting points, suffers from its massive chronological breadth,

¹²² FM 1-45

¹²³ Though P. Sijpesteijn has commented on aspects of it in ‘Building an Egyptian identity’, in A. Ahmed, B. Sadeghi, and M. Bonner (eds.), *The Islamic Scholarly Tradition: Studies in History, Law, and Thought in Honor of Professor Michael Allan Cook* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 85-105.

¹²⁴ M. Cook, ‘Pharaonic History in Medieval Egypt’, *Studia Islamica* 57 (1983), pp. 69-71, 99, answer: not a lot.

¹²⁵ U. Haarmann, ‘Regional Sentiment’, pp. 55-66.

which leads to an unconvincingly grand narrative which misses the complexity of particular engagements with Egyptian history. Another oddity is that while he is aware of FM and notes it as a forerunner of *faḍā'il* literature, he frequently ascribes stories found in FM to much later texts without noting that that they were already extant, the most extreme example being his statement that 'according to the seventeenth-century al-Ishāqī al-Manūfī the Prophet would have lifted the *jizya* from all the Copts of Egypt, if Ibrāhīm, his son by Maria the Copt, had not died so young', failing to mention that this story had originated at least eight hundred years beforehand.¹²⁶ Further, Haarmann's view of Egyptian identity seems to see all Egyptian communities passively having their identities corrupted. Therefore, the Copts 'took over many of the profoundly Islamic values that were implicit in the language of the Koran' and have their pre-Islamic history appropriated for the narrative of Islam triumphant, while the Arabs 'allowed themselves to be gathered in and Egyptianized'.¹²⁷ My approach will attempt to recover some of the internal coherence in Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's configuration of these stories about Egypt before Islam which would have such a long and influential future, considering what arguments are being made, the cultural resources being used to make them, and how these resources are transformed by their inclusion in a chronological narrative.

The backbone of *Futuḥ Miṣr*'s pre-Islamic section is stories of the prophets whose careers brought them to Egypt, particularly Abraham, Joseph, Jacob, and of course Moses. 'Biblical' prophets were a commonplace feature of Muslim pre-Islamic history-writing. However,

¹²⁶ Ibid. p.58; FM 53.

¹²⁷ U. Haarmann, 'Regional Sentiment', p. 55.

whereas some Muslim historians such as al-Mas‘ūdī or al-Ya‘qūbī divided the ‘sacred’ history of the Israelites from the narrative of the non-monotheistic civilisations which preceded Islam, FM weaves the history of the monotheistic prophets into the same narrative as what we might call the ‘secular’ history of Egypt (i.e. that of peoples and rulers not considered to be monotheists).¹²⁸ In this sense, like the histories of al-Ṭabarī or al-Dīnawarī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s history is presented as a straight history in which the Israelites and prophets happen to act, rather than a sequence of prophets from the earliest to the last. While the latter arrangement emphasises the teleological Muslim view of pre-Islamic history culminating in the mission of Muḥammad, and which would later be enshrined in the genre of *qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’* (stories of prophets), Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s arrangement emphasises the regional focus of his work. Prophets and the Israelites come and go, but the narrative remains tied to Egypt, to the extent that the mission of Muḥammad is not covered at all and Muḥammad’s only role in the narrative is to dispatch the envoy to al-Muqawqis which was discussed above.

The greater part of the pre-Islamic history is, nevertheless, that of the interactions of the prophets before Muḥammad with Egypt. This is in some respects unsurprising: Egypt is one of the very few geographical locations explicitly mentioned in the Koran, to a Muslim the speech of God himself. Therefore, when it came to making claims about the sacred significance of a location, such as those Paul Cobb has analysed regarding Syria, Egypt did not

¹²⁸ A.Shboul, *Al-Mas‘ūdī*, pp. 95-6.

have to beat around the burning bush.¹²⁹ Of course, as Haarmann noted, Egypt has a conflicted place in Koranic and Biblical stories, being the location of the enslavement of the Israelites and the land of Moses' Pharaoh, the archetype of the unbelieving ruler who brings down divine punishment on himself and his people. However, as Cobb shows in his article on Syria, it became common in *faḍā'il* literature to emphasise even apparently negative connections to pre-Muḥammad prophetic history, the virtue transferring to the location from its involvement in 'humanity's relationship with God . . . regardless of what God might have said about it'.¹³⁰ Further, this focus on prophetic events within Egypt, tied together through a loose non-prophetic Egyptian history which is frequently little more than a king list with occasional mention of tyranny of particular rulers, makes the moving force which drives events providential, and the main theme of the narrative is Egypt's engagement with prophesy. I would argue that the main function this serves in the text is to make pre-Islamic events the result of divine agency and therefore give them the force to establish particular paradigms about Egyptian history. The story of Noah's children, which establishes the status of the Copts as indigenous possessors of Egypt while simultaneously explaining that their fate to be dominated by Romans, Persians and then Arabs is a case in point. Likewise, the story of Abraham, which as we have seen establishes the paradigm of non-Muslim rulers of Egypt submitting to a prophet, creates a narrative echo linking Abraham and Muḥammad, thus affirming Muḥammad's place in the prophetic lineage, and at the same time introduces the

¹²⁹ P.Cobb, 'Virtual Sacrality: making Muslim Syria sacred before the crusades', *Medieval Encounters* 8.1 (2002), pp. 35-55.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* p.46.

genealogical origins of the Arabs, their connection to the Copts, and the subsequent obligation to treat the Copts well.

At this point it should be noted that the original source of these pre-Islamic prophetic stories in Islamic literature seems to have been the need to explicate references to prophets in the Koran, which have been well-characterised as highly allusive, fragmentary, and lacking in detail.¹³¹ FM's prophetic stories demonstrate much use of exegetical material, not only in using chains of authorities (*isnāds*) going back to Ibn 'Abbās or other heroes of early exegesis (*tafsīr*), but also in style. One method of *tafsīr*, embodied by our earliest extant exegesis, that of Muqātil b. Sulaymān (d. 767), was to 'construct an organic narrative around the Koranic verses in which the words of God are inserted in a coherent way'.¹³² Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's narratives about Moses' crossing the Red Sea are clearly derived from this style of *tafsīr*, as shown by their repeated return to Pharaoh's Koranic refrain, 'For they are a small band, and they are enraging us', describing the fleeing Israelites.¹³³ An exegetical source for this section is also evidenced in the inclusion of various variant reports about the meaning of obscure Koranic terms such as the glosses for the word '*rahw*', such glosses being a key part of *tafsīr*.¹³⁴ However, FM is clearly appropriating this material from the genre of exegesis selectively, and redeploying it for different purposes. No attempt is ever made to comprehensively cover the biographies of those prophets who came to Egypt, nor to systematically gloss all Koranic

¹³¹ R. Tottoli, *Biblical Prophets in the Qur'ān and Muslim Literature* (Richmond, 2002), p. 97.

¹³² *Ibid.* p.98.

¹³³ *inna hā'ulā'i la-shirdhimatun qalilūna wa innahum lanā la-ghā'izūna*, Q26.54-5.

¹³⁴ FM, p. 24.

passages about Egypt, and as such the material collected in FM can, on occasion, appear as allusive and fragmentary as the Koranic passages which *tafsīr* was designed to elucidate. Of course, educated Muslims would be well aware of the stories of these prophets (as were, in all probability, the uneducated, through preaching and storytelling). My contention is that the fragmentary nature of the prophetic tales included in FM is in fact due to the general narratives of these stories being very well known, and that FM's prophetic stories can be viewed as selected extracts drawn from a broad body of exegetical and folkloric material accessible to the author, designed to place stress on particular ideas about Egypt's place in the relationship between God and mankind throughout history. A close inspection of the Joseph-story in FM should serve to elucidate this.

The story of Joseph makes up the longest continual narrative in the Koran, which outlines the salient features of Joseph's life as found in Genesis, somewhat abbreviated, up to the point of his bringing his father Jacob to Egypt.¹³⁵ However in FM, Joseph's tale begins not with his brothers' selling him into slavery, as in the Bible or Koran. Rather, the list of successive rulers of Egypt since the last prophetic episode is recounted: we learn that the Amalekites conquered Egypt (pausing only for a discussion of the descent of the Amalekites from Shem, thus integrating them into the previously established role of the sons of Shem as those allotted royal authority), after which we are told that the son of the Amalekite conqueror was the master of Joseph, i.e. the Pharaoh who ruled in Joseph's time.¹³⁶ The entire business of the

¹³⁵ Q12.3-101; R.Tottoli, *Biblical Prophets*, pp. 28-31.

¹³⁶ FM, p.13.

brothers, which is a central aspect of the koranic story, is passed over in silence, as is the reason for Joseph's being in prison in Egypt. Rather we meet him in prison whence he is summoned to interpret the king's dream, about which we are told nothing. Pharaoh, suitably impressed by Joseph's dream-interpreting when his priests and sorcerers had failed, appoints Joseph in charge of his kingdom and retires to his harem. The famine, which Pharaoh's dream presages in both biblical and koranic versions, then strikes, though here this is not explicitly linked to Pharaoh's vision, and the people sell their possessions to Joseph to buy food until he has gained for Pharaoh all their gold, silver, flocks, and land.¹³⁷ In the details of Joseph's dealing with the famine, FM goes beyond the information provided in the Koran, which focuses entirely on the rapprochement between Joseph and his brothers once he is installed in office in Egypt, and clearly does so by following the Genesis narrative which the Koran leaves off, down to the detail of the imposition of a tithe of a fifth of all produce on the lands Pharaoh has gained as a result of Joseph's famine-profiteering.¹³⁸ Other details in the story of Joseph and Jacob, such as Jacob entering Egypt with a household of seventy, and Pharaoh's first question to Jacob being how old he is are also extra-Koranic and clearly derived from Genesis. However FM also contains material from other sources, as variant reports are given that Jacob entered with ninety-three not seventy followers, and he answers Pharaoh that he is 120 years old rather than 130 as in the Bible.¹³⁹ Thus, while providing extra-Koranic information which clearly derives from the Muslim exegetical tradition and its engagement

¹³⁷ FM, p.13.

¹³⁸ Gen. 47.13-26

¹³⁹ FM, p.17; Gen. 47.9, 27.

with Judaeo-Christian scripture, the Joseph-story in FM does not flesh out the Koranic narrative in a systematic manner, and implicitly relies on the reader's knowledge of the Koran or at least the general thrust of the Joseph-story to make sense.

The exegesis in FM is in fact profoundly uninterested in the moral and spiritual aspects of Joseph's story before he is given authority over Egypt, undeniably the primary concern of the Koranic story, rather expanding the narrative with information about Joseph's actions and their consequences once he is appointed to rule Egypt. Dominating this concern, occupying three times as much space as all the rest of the information about Joseph, is an entirely uncanonical tale in which Joseph institutes the irrigation system of Egypt.¹⁴⁰ After seventy years of Joseph's authority in Egypt, Pharaoh's counsellors plot against him and accuse him of senility. Though making some resistance, Pharaoh agrees to put Joseph to whatever test they wish. They ask Joseph to construct an irrigation system which will make al-Fayyūm, a region of Egypt entirely dependent on water diverted from the Nile and therefore barren at the outset of the story, cultivable. The implication is that this is clearly considered a near-impossible task set to depose Joseph from authority. Joseph, like a good Muslim, says he will do it should God will it. God reveals to Joseph that he should dig three canals and outlines where each should run in order to water al-Fayyūm, at which point Joseph assigns workers to carry it out, which they do in seventy days, much to Pharaoh and his advisors' astonishment. Finally, Joseph reveals a plan to have a tribe from each district of Egypt build

¹⁴⁰ FM pp. 14-16.

and settle a village in al-Fayyūm to make it flourish, and that his system of irrigation would 'render to each village drinking water at the time when water would not reach them if I hadn't made it'. Pharaoh asks him, 'Is this from the kingdom of heaven?', and Joseph responds in the affirmative. Further traditions at this point say that Joseph weighed the land and the water, and established the science of engineering in Egypt, of which the Egyptians were not previously aware.¹⁴¹

This story goes far beyond any attempt to elucidate the Koran's message about Joseph, and is clearly about the sources of the legendary fertility of Egypt. We have already noted Christopher Wickham's comments on the essential continuity of socio-economic life in Egypt, and the reliance on a long-established and maintained system of irrigation dating back to Pharaonic times. The annual inundation of the Nile was the heartbeat of Egyptian life and the irrigation canals its veins and arteries. The importance of the maintenance of the irrigation canals and that money must be spent on this to avoid irreparable damage to the wealth of Egypt is clearly outlined later in FM in the context of disputes over revenues between 'Umar I, the caliph, and 'Amr, the first governor of Egypt, in which 'Umar notes that 'the pharaohs were concerned with the land and worked it in masterful ways despite the intensity of their insolence and disbelief'.¹⁴² By making Joseph the originator of the network of canals and founder of Egyptian engineering, the abundance of Egypt is made a blessing of the 'kingdom of heaven'. Thus rather than the Muslims being passive recipients of the achievements of a

¹⁴¹ FM 16.

¹⁴² FM 152-4, 158, 160.

powerful earlier civilisation, and not only that, a polytheistic civilisation which actively persecuted the prophets, the technological achievements of the Egyptians are cleansed and sanctified. The blessings of Egypt are woven into an antiquity which Muslims can consider their own heritage, and become the legacy of another instance of the submission of political authority by an Egyptian non-Muslim ruler to a prophet.

We have already noted this theme in the previous section on the Copts, where we saw how Muḥammad's prophetic status was underlined through the narrative echo of Abraham, where both Pharaoh and al-Muqawqis have the authority of a prophet revealed to them by a divine intervention and demonstrate their acceptance of this by gifting the prophets with Coptic women, thus tying the claimed genealogical affinity (*raḥim/ṣihr*) of the Arabs and the Copts together with Egyptian submission to monotheistic authority. Joseph is the third iteration of this story. He is given authority by the pharaoh of his time and like Abraham and Muḥammad brings about Arab-Coptic affinity through his marriage to a Coptic woman, as is explicitly noted early in FM.¹⁴³ Through this extended passage on his canal-building, Egypt's agricultural abundance, described by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam as 'the likeness of paradise', is tied into this repeating paradigm of Egyptian submissions to proper religious authority. A myth more directly associating the fertility of Egypt with the blessed status of Joseph is recorded a little later, when after his death:

Joseph, PBUH, was buried in one of the banks of the Nile and the side he was in became fertile while the other became arid, so they transferred him to the other side and the side they had transferred him to became fertile while the other

¹⁴³ FM 4, ll. 11-14.

became arid. When they realised this, they gathered his bones and put them in an iron casket and attached a chain to it. They erected a pole on the bank of the Nile and placed at its base an iron peg, attached the chain to the peg, and cast the coffin into the middle of the Nile, so the two sides were fertile together.¹⁴⁴

Here, another monotheistic justification is found for the long-standing idea of the Nile as a sacred river.

These episodes make it fairly clear that a major concern of the pre-Islamic section of FM is to capitalise on the opportunities granted by Egypt's setting as a location for episodes of pre-Islamic prophetic history and invest the very landscape, both natural and man-made, with a sacred gloss. Another intriguing example of this phenomena occurs as an aside in the exchange between Pharaoh and Jacob once Joseph has brought his father to Egypt. We are told that:

Bamīn, the sorcerer of Pharaoh had already described the appearance of Jacob, Joseph, and Moses PBUT, in his books, and related that the ruin of Egypt and the death of her people was in their hands. He erected the ancient temples and the depictions of those by whose hand Egypt would be made ruin. When he saw Jacob standing before his seat the first thing that he asked was to say to him, 'Who do you worship, old man?' Jacob said to him, 'I worship God, the deity of everything'. He said to him, 'How do you worship that which you cannot see?' Jacob said to him, 'He is greater and more exalted than that which anyone sees'. Bamīn said, 'We see our gods'. Jacob said, 'Your gods are the work of the hands of men, who die and decay. Our deity is greater and higher, and closer to us than the jugular vein'. Bamīn looked to Pharaoh and he said, 'This is that which has the destruction of our countries in its hands'.

¹⁴⁴ FM 18-19.

This passage is interesting as another example which diverges from the Koranic narrative, in which we are never told that Jacob meets Pharaoh, and is introduced with details evoking the Genesis narrative. The reference to the ruin of Egypt is clearly to the impending drowning of the Egyptians pursuing Moses through the Red Sea, which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam will soon narrate at length.¹⁴⁵ Of particular interest here is the notion that the ancient temples of Egypt are populated by images of Israelite prophets foreseen by the magic of Pharaoh’s sorcerers as the ruin and destruction of Pharaonic Egypt. The remains of Pharaonic Egypt are impressive enough today after another millennium of ruin, and despite the long-standing Christianisation of Egypt must have presented a challenging spectacle of Egypt’s former glory to Muslims. Sarah Savant has demonstrated the way in which the colossal ruins of Ctesiphon, on the doorstep of Baghdād, and particularly the ‘Iwan of Khusrau’ became an ‘expressive relic’ which ‘focused reflection on a great civilization’ and produced long-standing literary traditions which used conflicting caliphal policies towards the ruins to articulate anxieties about the Persian non-Muslim heritage.¹⁴⁶ On the one hand, rulers might attempt their destruction to showcase their power over the infidel civilisations of the past, but the immovable persistence of such vast edifices as the Iwan of Khusrau unsettlingly resisted caliphal power to eradicate the vestiges of non-Muslim Persia. Other arguments are made in these stories that the Iwan should be left standing as a monument to the power of God, who could raise up the Arabs to defeat the might of a civilisation which could produce such great

¹⁴⁵ FM 23-6.

¹⁴⁶ S. Savant, ‘Forgetting Ctesiphon: Iran’s Pre-Islamic Past, ca. 800-1100’, in P. Wood (ed.), *History and Identity in the late antique east, 500-1000* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 171.

constructions. This reasoning, however, has a distinctly *shu'ūbī* (pro-Persian, anti-Arab cultural discourse) taste, given that it exalts God's might by emphasising the wretchedness of the pre-Islamic Arabs compared to the Persians.¹⁴⁷ The traditions which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam records about Egypt's pre-monotheistic past do not convey the same tension over claims of cultural superiority on behalf of the indigenous non-Arabs. Rather they reflect a much less problematic engagement with the ruins of the antique past: the grand constructions of the Pharaohs are in FM detoxified and rebranded as signs of the forthcoming triumph of monotheism.

No doubt this is in part because Christianised Egyptian culture on the arrival of Islam no longer, at least at an elite level, directly identified with the Pharaonic past. Indeed, given the shared claim to the prophetic legacy by Islam, Christianity, and Judaism, it seems highly likely that the Islamicisation of the Pharaonic inheritance which FM's pre-Islamic section clearly represents built upon Jewish and Christian appropriations of Pharaonic history, and thus represents a common confrontation of the polytheist past. The ability to create common ground in dealing with the non-monotheistic past in Egypt, to create a narrative of Egypt's past which could be accepted by both the 'indigenous' culture and the incoming Muslims who came to see Egypt as their own, must have been a factor in why Egypt came to be both Islamised and Arabised, in contrast to the former territories of the Sassanian empire which were converted to Islam but which retained their own non-Arab Muslim cultural identity. In

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. pp. 178-9.

this respect, it is worth re-emphasising the contrast between the pre-Islamic Egyptian history of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, which retains no real information about Egypt’s non-Muslim past that could be used to construct a scholarly history of Egypt, and Iraqi or Iranian-based Muslim historians writing about pre-Islamic Persia, whose narratives, though problematic, clearly reflect something of the reality of Sassanian Persia. Such genuine interest in Egyptian history is not present in FM, rather it is subsumed into a prophetically-driven past which all monotheists could subscribe to. However, this potentially common vision of the ancient past is also engineered to prepare the ground for Muḥammad’s people’s conquest of Egypt by developing the paradigm of non-Muslim authority submitting to a prophet, and to make genealogical closeness and intermingling between Copts and Arabs a result of this paradigm, an agenda which I would argue engages with the processes of conversion and intermarriage which were of particular relevance in the author’s own time.

The final pre-Muḥammad prophetic episode in Egypt which is recounted in detail by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is that of Moses’ exodus.¹⁴⁸ The focus of the narrative here is Pharaoh and his men being drowned in the sea. The plagues sent by God on the people of Egypt are discarded, as is any discussion of why Moses is fleeing Egypt apart from that God had instructed him to depart on his journey through the night. Common peculiarities of the Islamic version of this story are included, such as the detail that the angel Gabriel came to ensure that Pharaoh and his people all followed the Israelites into the somewhat suspicious situation of the parted sea,

¹⁴⁸ FM 23-6.

and that when the sea began to crash together again Pharaoh tried to convert to save his soul but Gabriel prevented him by stuffing his mouth with the mud of the sea-bed.¹⁴⁹ Particular stress is placed upon the vast number of Egyptians who were drowned with Pharaoh: ‘the chief men and notables of the nobility of the people of Egypt, more than two million of them’.¹⁵⁰ In the next section, explaining the fallout from this event, we are told that not one of the nobility (*ashrāf*) of Egypt remained, only slaves and paid servants, which led to the noblewomen of Egypt taking governance into their own hands and electing the foremost of them, Queen Dalūka, to rule Egypt.¹⁵¹ The noblewomen choose not to remain without husbands, however, rather freeing their slaves or servants and marrying them, though ‘they imposed on the men the condition that they [the men] would not do anything without their permission, and they [the men] agreed to this’. A further report then states that ‘the Copts abide by this to this day . . . not one of them will sell or buy without saying, “I will consult my wife”’.¹⁵² It is this episode which led Michael Cook to conclude that the pre-Islamic history of Egypt presented by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was ‘not one composed from the viewpoint of the natives . . . [t]he idea that the Egyptians have been hen-pecked since the Exodus was one calculated to amuse the Arab conquerors, but hardly to flatter the Copts’.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ FM 24-5.

¹⁵⁰ FM 23.

¹⁵¹ FM 26.

¹⁵² FM 28.

¹⁵³ Cook, ‘Pharonic History’, p. 71.

I would argue that the perspective of FM's pre-Islamic history reveals slightly more than an Arab joke at the Copts' expense. One feature is that the regency of Queen Dalūka, against expectations, is presented in a positive light as the reign of a resourceful woman finding ways to defend her country and its sovereignty despite being almost entirely denuded of manpower, firstly through a massive programme of fortification, secondly through enlisting the aid of the most powerful magicians of Egypt.¹⁵⁴ Petra Sijpesteijn has recently argued that Dalūka and her fortifications, which became a common feature of Egyptian-Muslim writing about the pre-Islamic past, came to symbolise a new phase in Egyptian history purged of the contamination of the pharaonic past which was washed away by the Red Sea.¹⁵⁵ Another important aspect of FM's story is the expansion of the koranic idea that some of Pharaoh's sorcerers converted to Islam in the face of Moses' demonstration of his God's power. This episode is given prominence in FM's initial presentation of the virtues of Egypt, in which we are told that 240,252 of the sorcerers and their followers converted to belief in the true God and followed Moses out of Egypt, and were notable for their resistance to the temptation which befell the Israelites to worship the golden calf.¹⁵⁶ Later we are given further information about this community of Egyptians, that after the flight from Egypt and the death of Pharaoh, they asked Moses' permission to return to their people and property. Moses granted them this and we are told that they 'became monks in the peaks of the mountains. These were the first to become monks, and they were called "the party" [*shī'a*], and a sect of

¹⁵⁴ FM 26-8.

¹⁵⁵ P. Sijpesteijn, 'Egyptian Identity', pp. 101-3.

¹⁵⁶ FM 4-5, referring to the events at Q 7.103-126, 26.23-51. The origin of the figure is obscure.

them remained with Moses § until God, the mighty and exalted, took him'.¹⁵⁷ This seems to reflect some awareness that monasticism was born in the high places of Egypt, though it links the foundation of monasticism to this Pharaonic-era rejection of the world rather than the Christian desert fathers. Crucially, it develops the notion that the Egyptians have some agency when it comes to their interaction with prophethood: while the majority of the Copts follow their leader into destruction, those who follow the lead of the prophet are led to safety, and even given leave to return to their families and properties. Cook is surely correct to say that this history was not written from the viewpoint of the natives: of course, the majority of 'indigenous' Egyptians at the time of writing would not have been Muslims.¹⁵⁸ It would be odd indeed for a Muslim to have written a history from a non-Muslim perspective. However, the subjugations and humiliations which the text uses to characterise the Copts are more than blunt disparagement. In all cases their inferior status is causally linked to their rejection of prophetic message and authority. Dalūka and her ladies would not have had to marry their slaves and been able to emasculate them if the Egyptian men hadn't followed Pharaoh in pursuit of Moses and thereby been destroyed. Contrarily, indigenous Egyptians becoming part of the community of the believers is presented as legitimate: those who followed Moses as believers prospered. Again, close analysis of the implications of FM's history of pre-Islamic Egypt reveals attempts to explain the circumstances of Islamic Egypt, in which a majority of Egypt's population rejected the Islamic faith and as such endured inferior status in the eyes of Muslims. This disability as a result of faithlessness is made a continual theme of the history

¹⁵⁷ FM 44.

¹⁵⁸ Cook, 'Pharaonic history', p. 71.

of Egypt's people, along with the counter-theme that Egypt's blessings derive from submission to prophetic authority, and that her people can redeem themselves from the error of their community, as with Miṣr, who was granted the land of Egypt for his people, or the sorcerers and their followers who went with Moses. This historical pattern constructed by the author is surely loaded with analogical significance to his own time: though the Copts as a community reject the last prophet, Muḥammad, and justly suffer therefore, the way is open for their *islām* (submission) to him, and the concurrent blessings it will bring.

The focus on these stories of korano-biblical prophets to make up Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's pre-Islamic history of Egypt should be clear by now, as should be some of the aspects of these stories which he wished to stress to his audience. An important question which remains, however, is that of his sources. Identifying prior instances of the particular details Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam used would require an exhaustive search of Christian and Jewish scriptures and apocrypha, an investigation beyond the scope of this essay. In Chapter Seven we will see how Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's *isnāds* represent the origins of this pre-Islamic material, and how that allows us to observe the particular effects he engineered through juxtaposition of different sources. At this point, however, we may simply note that though much of the detail in these stories appears to derive from non-Muslim traditions, this is not how he represents their origins, either ascribing them to earlier Egyptian Muslim authorities, or semi-legendary early Muslim exegetes such as Ibn 'Abbās or Ka'b al-Aḥbār, a standard strategy in Islamic exegesis

and stories-of-prophets.¹⁵⁹ By doing so, he gave these originally Judaeo-Christian details a measure of legitimacy within the Islamic tradition, asserting that they stemmed from independent Muslim knowledge of the past. Therefore, these stories about Egyptian antiquity, rather than being accepted because they are part of an accepted pre-Islamic canon, are presented as naturalised, Muslim knowledge.

A final inspection of one of *FM*'s narratives of pre-Islamic Egypt, should serve to demonstrate some of the polemical opportunities which this strategy offered. After the last Roman-Persian war's effect on Egypt is recounted, the final part of the pre-Islamic section is taken up by an explanation of the origins of the city of Alexandria, which is of course bound up with the story of Alexander the Great.¹⁶⁰ Alexander is associated in the Islamic tradition with an obscure koranic figure named Dhū -l-Qarnayn (which might be translated as the 'possessor of two horns'), whom the Koran makes the suppressor of Gog and Magog.¹⁶¹ Whether this character was always intended to mean Alexander, or how quickly Muslims came to understand him as Alexander is disputed in scholarship, but this question was well-established enough for al-Jāḥiẓ, a contemporary of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, to present as an

¹⁵⁹ R. Tottoli, *Biblical Prophets*, pp.89-92.

¹⁶⁰ *FM* 37-43.

¹⁶¹ The literature on Alexander in Arabic and Persian texts is substantial: a decent introduction and bibliography to the topic is provided by P. Weinfield, 'The Islamic Alexander: A religious and political theme in Arabic and Persian literature' (Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 2008). See also R. Stoneman, 'Alexander the Great in the Arabic Tradition', in *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden, 2003); B. Wheeler, 'Moses or Alexander? Early Islamic Exegesis of Qur'ān 18:60-65', *JNES* 57 (1998), pp. 191-215; F. Doufikar-Aerts, 'A Legacy of the *Alexander Romance* in Arab Writings: Al-Iskandar, Founder of Alexandria', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (London, 1994), p. 327. The Qur'ānic story is Q18.83-100.

established topos the endless wrangling between exegetes over whether Dhū -l-Qarnayn was or was not Alexander.¹⁶² Nevertheless, in FM's main narrative about Dhū -l-Qarnayn, we are told that he was a Roman. In this narrative a pair of *shaykhs* of the Tujīb tribe are having a dull day in Alexandria, so set out to the house of one of the companions of the prophet who has settled in Egypt. To pass the time he tells them one of his experiences with the prophet. In this a group of Jews or Christians come to Medina, carrying books, wishing to test the prophet's knowledge. Firstly, Muḥammad stresses his own ignorance about whatever they might ask. Then, however, he prays to God, and receives a revelation about their inquiry. Without even asking them what they want to know, he then gives them a potted version of the extremely common late antique myth of Alexander the Great. He recounts that Alexander was a Roman and that he founded Alexandria. After the foundation of Alexandria, Alexander was told by an angel that God had given him authority over the entire earth, which would result in Alexander teaching the ignorant and helping the wise. Muḥammad then briefly describes Alexander's legendary conquests to the ends of the earth, in which he pauses only to suppress the biblical horrors Gog and Magog. Muḥammad finishes his discourse, and the Jews or Christians respond that Muḥammad has answered the very question they wished to ask, and told the story of Alexander exactly as they have it in the books they have brought with them.¹⁶³

¹⁶² R. Stoneman, 'Alexander the Great in the Arabic Tradition', in *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden, 2003), p. 9, ft. 26.

¹⁶³ FM 38-9.

This passage is patently derived from exegetical material, as it constructs the perfect frame-story (itself presented within the frame story of the dull day in Alexandria) for the opening line of the Koranic passage, which begins, ‘They will ask you about Dhū -l-Qarnayn’.¹⁶⁴ However it also provides a good model of the Muslim method for laying claim to the pre-Islamic past used by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. A common late antique narrative of the ancient past is retold, but the details of the story are remoulded to suit a Muslim understanding. While recognising the non-Arabic origin of the story, the narrative makes Muslim knowledge of the story independent of the non-Arabic tradition, and in fact ascribes it to divine revelation. The correspondence between the Muslim version and the non-Arabic tradition, rather than proving the reliance of Muslim knowledge on non-Arabic sources, in fact proves the truth of Muslim revelation, a fact here accepted by the Jews or Christians. It goes without saying that the ascription of Muslim knowledge to revelation allows Muslims to claim the ultimate authority for any polemically motivated divergence between the Muslim and the non-Arab version of antiquity.

In an article discussing exegetical association of a different Koranic passage with the Alexander myth Brannon Wheeler has argued that it is ‘important to identify the aims of the commentators in making certain allusions and in drawing certain connections between the Koran and other late antique motifs’.¹⁶⁵ He focuses on how commentaries associated motifs

¹⁶⁴ Q 18.83.

¹⁶⁵ B. Wheeler, ‘Moses or Alexander? Early Islamic Exegesis of Qur’ān 18:60-65’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998), p. 215.

which were current in stories about Alexander with Israelite prophets such as Moses to construct an image of Moses which authorised Muḥammad's prophethood. Here, however, whatever the original reasons for exegetes associating Dhū al-Qarnayn with Alexander the Great, the primary function of this association is clearly to give the city of Alexandria a koranic heritage and thus a 'Muslim' origin. This is not the only way in which Muslims tried to integrate Alexandria into their own understanding of sacred history. Another report says that a stone was found in Alexandria carved with an Ozymandian inscription in which one Shaddād b. 'Ād hubristically claims to be the founder of the city, erector of the columns, and a man who will not grow old or die.¹⁶⁶ This is no incidental trivia. The 'Ād were a tribe known by pre-Islamic poetry who gained several mentions in the Koran as the tribe to whom the Arabian prophet Hūd was sent, who are associated with a place called Iram of the Columns, and who were destroyed by God's wrath. Tradition made Shaddād the 'Ādite ruler who built Iram of the Columns, therefore the claim that his inscription is found in Alexandria is that Alexandria was the site of Iram, another attempt to ascribe koranic resonance to Egypt.¹⁶⁷ This was not a unique claim: the location of Shaddād's city is unclear in the Koran, and Syrian Muslims were making the same claims for Damascus.¹⁶⁸ Widespread association of Alexander with a koranic figure, however, gave the Egyptians a far more unique claim, and one which made their city-founder a koranic hero rather than villain.

¹⁶⁶ FM 41.

¹⁶⁷ Q 89.6-7; P. Cobb, 'Iram', EQ; R. Tottoli, "'Ād', EQ.

¹⁶⁸ Cobb, 'Virtual Sacrality', p. 46.

The particulars of the foundation-story of Alexandria as found in *FM* also indicate this stress on Alexander's positive role within Muslim sacred history. We are told:

When he [Alexander] finished his construction an angel came to him. He ascended with him until he had raised him very high and said to him, 'Look at what is beneath you'. He said, 'I see my city, and I see other cities with it'. Then he ascended with him higher and said, 'Look'. He said, 'My city has mingled with the cities so that I do not recognise it' Then he went higher still and said, 'Look'. He said, 'I see my city alone, and no other'. The angel said to him, 'This is the whole land and that which you see encompassing it is the sea. Your lord wanted only that you be shown the land. He has given you authority in it, and you will teach the ignorant man and strengthen the wise man'.¹⁶⁹

Alexander's conquests are therefore made the result of divine grant of authority. The angel raises him to ever higher levels of elevation which initially obscure Alexandria to Alexander, but ultimately bring him to the realisation that the world is his city. Weinfield has argued that 'from a very early point in Islamic history, the idea that Alexander's reign was a mirror of the Islamic caliphate became a standard element of Islamic political allegory'.¹⁷⁰ That allegorical reading of Alexander's empire, bestowed by God so that he might teach the ignorant and aid the wise, underlies the narrative in *FM*, and as such another element of pre-Islamic Egyptian history is appropriated by the text to foreshadow the Islamic conquests. Alexandria is given centre stage as a site of Dhū -l-Qarnayn's revelation and centre-point of a providentially-ordained empire, indeed in this narrative Alexandria itself becomes the world.

¹⁶⁹ *FM* 38-9.

¹⁷⁰ P.Weinfield, 'Islamic Alexander', p. 22.

Thus Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam gives us a unique iteration of foundation stories of Alexandria, which matched the context of their time. While pseudo-Callisthenes’ ‘Alexander Romance’ had Alexander lay out the foundations of his city in meal which was then consumed by birds, the augurs interpreted that ‘[t]his city which has been built shall feed the entire world, and men born in it shall be everywhere; like birds they shall travel through the entire world’, it reflected Alexandria’s role as trade-entrepot and bread-basket of the Roman world.¹⁷¹ Al-Mas‘ūdī, writing in the tenth century, has another story of Alexander’s foundation in which the great general’s plan to lay the foundations at the most astrologically auspicious moment is disrupted, leading Alexander to foresee ‘its early perdition and its desolation and a confusion of kings ruling over it’.¹⁷² Perhaps this reflects Alexandria’s diminished status in al-Mas‘ūdī’s time after another century of power in Egypt shifting away from it and to al-Fuṣṭāṭ. Or perhaps, after the emergence of sub-states with *de facto* independence from ‘Abbāsīd Baghdad or Samarrā’, the resonance of a story about a city as foundation-piece of a world empire was now firmly one of hubris, or as al-Mas‘ūdī’s Alexander himself writes in his founding inscription: ‘demonstrating the vanity of the world and cautioning against being deluded by it or relying too much on it’.¹⁷³

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Alexander does not develop this theme of the transience of earthly power, though it is present in the Shaddād-myth. Rather, further discussion of Alexander is

¹⁷¹ F. Doufīkar-Aerts, ‘A Legacy of the *Alexander Romance* in Arab Writings: Al-Iskandar, Founder of Alexandria’, in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (London, 1994), p. 327.

¹⁷² Ibid. p.325.

¹⁷³ Ibid. p.336.

limited to the debate over whether he was an angel, a prophet, or just a righteous believer, and to the origin of his epithet.¹⁷⁴ The pristine marble of Roman Alexandria is celebrated in a series of extraordinary tales of it being so bright and reflective that a seamstress could thread her needle by moonlight without aid of a lamp. The idea of Alexandria as a Muslim city restored to Islam by the conquests, thus integrating the conquests into the lineage of sacred history and prophetic acts upon Egypt, is contained in a legend of the five great mosques of Alexandria having been built by Solomon, Moses, the Islamic Alexander, the mystical figure al-Khiḍr, and finally the conquering Muslim general ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ.¹⁷⁵ Therefore, Alexander and Alexandria’s story, as retold in FM, presents another positive Muslim reading of Egypt’s antique heritage. Again, a way is found to interpret Egypt’s past in a way compatible with the monotheistic sensibilities of its population, and another hero of Egypt’s past is woven into the fabric of the Muslim story of sacred history, creating common cultural ground between Muslims and ‘indigenous’ Egyptians, but on Muslim terms.

FM’s pre-Islamic history is rooted in *tafsīr* and Islamic stories of the prophets generated by the Koran. These are redeployed to serve not an exegetical purpose or give fully fledged accounts of the lives of the prophets in Egypt, but to create an allusive intertextual relationship between Egyptian history and narratives sacred to Muslims. Much of the material which is used to supplement the Koranic stories of these events originated in non-Muslim canon and apocrypha. However, in most cases the author’s presentation of his

¹⁷⁴ FM 39-40.

¹⁷⁵ FM 41-2.

sources either makes these stories the result of Muḥammad's revelation or subject to epistemological demands of Muslim knowledge. Therefore, at some point in these narratives' journey from being Christian or Jewish traditions to Islamic history recorded in FM, these narratives were naturalised as Muslim knowledge, with no sense of their being subject to non-Muslim verification or criticism. This gives Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam independent authority to stress whichever aspects of them he wishes, to the extent that he can deploy a version of the Alexander Romance to polemically assert Christian and Jewish acceptance of Muslim revelation. Beyond these polemical points, the key aspects which are stressed in the prophetic stories included in FM have to do with creating models of Egypt's past submission to prophets, and asserting that the blessings of Egypt are the direct result of this. Combined with the arguments for Muḥammad's legitimate place in the prophetic lineage, this effectively amounts to an extended argument for the submission of Egypt's people to Muḥammad's message. Narratologically, the returning theme of Egyptian submission to prophetic authority prepares the ground for the Muslim conquest of Egypt which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam narrates in the following section to take its place in the succession of prophetic events which make up the sacred history of Egypt. Therefore, while re-using extant narratives about Egypt's past, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam does so in a way which lays claim to them for the Muslim tradition, and which appropriates them for his own ends. In this case, he uses these stories at least in part to establish common cultural ground with non-Muslim Egyptian thought about Egypt's past, but also to frame the narrative to position Muḥammad's revelation and the Muslim conquest as the culmination of these stories. Implicitly, submission to Muslim authority and even conversion to Islam become the logical conclusions

of an Egyptian history which would have been uncannily recognisable to non-Muslim Egyptians.

Part I: Conclusions

Part I of this thesis has shown that FM, far from being a haphazard text, deploys material from a range of sources and genres to articulate particular ideas about Egyptian history, structuring it to guide the audience's response to the narrative of the Muslim conquest. While, as Brunschvig argued in the 1940s, this history is often bound up with legal concerns, these are not dry matters of protocol, but issues which spoke to the social and political world of ninth-century Egypt. In particular, this text shows itself to be deeply concerned with the ways in which Muslims and 'Copts' were associated, and the obligations which each community owed the other as determined by its presentation of the conquest-as-foundation-act of Islamic Egypt. An investigation of the historical context of the author's life has demonstrated that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and his family were invested in the traditional power-structures of Islamic Egypt: a local legal tradition increasingly informed by the influential ideas of Mālik b. Anas, and a political system in which power was held by the *wujūh* of Egypt, whose self-legitimation derived at least in part from their descent from the illustrious conquerors of Egypt. FM appears concerned to build a history of Egypt which embodies and celebrates the ideals underlying these power-structures, even as they were being challenged and dismantled by the changes in the 'Abbāsid caliphate and how it exerted its control over Egypt. In that sense, the underlying logic of FM's conquest-history appears nostalgic in a ninth-century light, aiming to preserve in text an ideal which is which was felt to be slipping away.

The readings of FM's presentation of the Copts and the history of Egypt before Islam suggest it represents something of how Muslim collective memory of Egypt was negotiated between an Arab conquest elite and a non-Arab population which participated in Islamic Egypt, both as converts and as a non-Muslim other. This negotiation within the text is of course presented from a Muslim perspective, but a dominating feature is its attempt to construct a workable past between a Muslim society founded in conquest and immigration and an Egyptian population which is constructed in complex ways under the label 'Copt'. The presence of the pre-Islamic history in the text is a strong reminder that Muslim society had to recognise and deal with its inheritance from and relationship with the non-Muslim past. In FM this past is Islamised and worked into the narrative of Islamic sacred history, employing originally non-Muslim traditions and knowledge to create common cultural ground with Egypt's monotheists in a way which gave Islam the polemical high ground. Studies of Islamisation have tended to focus solely on the economic aspects of conversion, however an understanding of the cultural mechanics which enabled and encouraged the shift from a Christian to a Muslim society is also vital. I hope that this study has illuminated some of these cultural mechanics in the particular case of early Islamic Egypt. FM is a rich resource with which to appreciate the historical imagination of Muslims in the ninth century, and the analysis of its presentation of Egyptian history gives us a window into the early significance of stories about ancient Egypt which, as demonstrated by their persistence into the medieval and early modern texts studied by Haarmann, were to be incredibly influential in the way which Egyptians thought about their past for centuries to come.

PART II

Sondage: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical method

Part II: Introduction

In Part I of this dissertation we analysed the ideas which FM contains about the Copts and pre-Islamic history on the basis of a ‘surface reading’. That is the text was understood as an instantiation of the historical thought-world of its composer, which could be contextualised in the third/ninth century. This approach borrows somewhat from that of Tayeb El Hibri, who argued in his book on the *rāshidūn* caliphs that their representation must be understood within an allusive framework to ‘the political, cultural, and religious interests of the ‘Abbasid period’.¹ However, while it is certainly possible to simply treat extant historical texts in the context of their compilation, a true historicisation of the ideas which they convey must pay heed to the origins of their information. El Hibri himself acknowledges that his contextualising arguments implicitly rely on ‘redating historical traditions to the ‘Abbasid period’.² However, sustained argumentation for the redating of the anecdotes which he discusses is lacking in *Parable and Politics*.³ While his readings of the representation of the *rāshidūn* caliphs are perceptive, even essential, his limited engagement with the origins of these narratives is frustrating. This must be, in large part, because he is dealing with the Arabic historical tradition as a whole. A recent study by Jens Schiener – engaging more closely with a targeted body of evidence and drawing on the techniques developed by Harald

¹ T. El Hibri, *Parable and politics in early Islamic history : the Rashidun caliphs* (New York, 2010), pp. xi, 23.

² Ibid, 22-3.

³ We hear, for example, that the ‘exact circumstances in which this religious image of ‘Umar was shaped are murky’ and that we must accept that it is ‘reasonable to assume’ and ‘most likely’ that it occurred in ninth-century Iraq, without any explicit discussion of the ‘historical narrators’ who formed this image. Ibid, p. 79.

Motzki – has demonstrated that it is possible to firmly identify and attribute some Arabic historical traditions as early as the second quarter of the second/eighth century.⁴ While the harvest of positive historical data about first/seventh century events has been slim, the most exciting potential for such approaches, as Toral-Niehoff has noted, may lie outside of factual reconstruction:

So zeigt Sch[einer] erstens, mit welchen Mitteln die ältesten, authentischen historiographischen Berichte sauber und fundiert von späteren, sekundären Ausformungen zu scheiden sind. Zweitens ermöglicht er einen Einblick in wichtige Transformationsprozesse und in die Interessen von deren Tradenten: So z. B., wie wann von wem und mit welchen Mittel eine Nachricht erweitert bzw. gekürzt wurde, welche Motive hinzugefügt und welche ausgelassen wurden.⁵

Part II of this thesis is devoted to finding ways to distinguish between earlier and later configurations of historical materials in FM, which will ultimately help us to understand the motivations which drove these reconfigurations. It is a series of exploratory trenches dug to penetrate beneath the surface of FM, asking what we can realistically infer when Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *isnāds* attribute the origins of his information to earlier authorities. Chapter Four examines his quotation of a source which is extant in order to produce a model for Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s citation practice when using written sources, and to ascertain diagnostic markers

⁴ J. Scheiner, *Die Eroberung von Damaskus: Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zur Historiographie in klassisch-islamischer Zeit* (Leiden, Boston, 2010), pp. 475-7. See the comments on the uses and limitations of Motzki’s *isnād-cum-matn* method in A. Görke, ‘Prospects and limits in the study of the historical Muḥammad’, in Nicolet Boekhoff-Van Der Voort, Kees Versteegh, and Joas Wagemakers, ‘Introduction’, in their (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam* (Leiden, 2011), especially pp. 142-5.

⁵ I. Toral-Niehoff, Review of J. Scheiner, *Die Eroberung von Damaskus*, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 106 (2011), p. 2.

in his *isnāds* which point to his use of written sources which are no longer extant. Chapter Five is a limited *isnād-cum-matn* study which seeks to place at least some of the material in FM in the second quarter of the second/eighth century. Chapter Six analyses how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam signals his repeated use of earlier written sources, and shows that these pre-existing sources formed the framework for every narrative sections of FM.

Chapter Four:

Quoting Ibn Hishām's *Sīra*: Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's use of his direct sources

In this chapter, we will examine Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's quotation of the most extensive package of information identifiable as a source for FM which also exists independently of FM.⁶ This is Ibn Ishāq's *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya* (*Biography of Muḥammad*) in the recension of Ibn Hishām, which is the rescension used by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and fortunately enough is the same rescension which survives today. Its survival allows us to compare text which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam attributes to Ibn Hishām's version of the *Sīra* with the original, illuminating exactly how Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam reused this material in FM.

On ten occasions, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam supports a report with a citation leading to Ibn Ishāq (b. 85/704, d. 150/767), the famous biographer of Muḥammad, using as his *isnād* Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833) on the authority of Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bakkā'ī (d. 183/799).⁷ Ibn Ishāq is not presented as the ultimate origin of the anecdote in most of these cases. Twice Ibn Ishāq's immediate informant is the Medinan historian al-Zuhri, twice the Egyptian jurist and historian Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, and three other informants in one case each.⁸ On three occasions

⁶ The approach in this chapter is comparable to that in A. Atassi, 'The Transmission of Ibn Sa'd's Biographical Dictionary *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*,' *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 12 (2012), pp. 56-80, though I discovered this article only after doing this research. There is another occasion when Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's citation of a work of *qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* can be compared against a contemporary of his who relates the story from the same teacher. See my discussion of his use and re-tooling of Wathīma b. Mūsā's story about Nebuchadnezzar below, pp. 245-54.

⁷ FM, 2, 4, 37, 39, 48, 116, 179, 252, 272 (twice).

⁸ The Ḥimṣī Thawr b. Yazīd (d. c. 153-5/770-2), the Medinan Ya'qūb b. 'Utba (d. 128/745-6), and a 'non-Arab' source.

Ibn Ishāq is the final link in the *isnād* with no further authority produced. The important thing to note is that while Ibn Ishāq relayed these reports from diverse sources, the line of transmission connecting Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to him is a single line through Ibn Hishām and al-Bakkā’ī. Thus, once Ibn Ishāq had collected his historical information into his *Sīra*, the transmission history described by these *isnāds* is not one of atomised reports being scattered among his students depending on their interest in the individual report, but rather a body of information passed on as a packaged whole.⁹ Therefore Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did not consult different individuals who had learned different elements of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*, but learned the lot from Ibn Hishām and could quote it on his authority. Further to the citations of Ibn Ishāq, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam quoted Ibn Hishām’s glosses on the *Sīra* five times.¹⁰ Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam never mentions the title of the ‘book’ from which this material came, or even the fact that it came from a larger work, demonstrating how *isnād* citation-practices – focussed on the individuals involved – can obscure the origins of quoted passages in fixed, pre-existing packages of information.

Of course, it is well known that Ibn Ishāq was the author of one of the earliest historical works in Arabic that might be considered a book, and that this ‘book’ survives to this day in the

⁹ A qualification: it is quite likely that there were diverse transmission practices from Ibn Ishāq and that depending on the circumstances his students may well have transmitted his reports ‘unpacked’, and so it would be more accurate to say that, in this case at least, we can be sure that there was a ‘packaged’ transmission practice operating alongside the ‘atomised’ transmission practice. It is also clear that Ibn Hishām did significant editorial work to this package, discarding some material, perhaps reordering it, and adding his own glosses. Even as he retooled it, however, it is still clear that the body of information he was transmitted was that brought together by Ibn Ishāq.

¹⁰ FM 12, 53, 94, 107, 286.

recension of Ibn Hishām, with different recensions (*riwāyas*) with textual variations being evidenced through citations in other sources, such as al-Ṭabarī, as well as a papyrus survival.¹¹ My point here is not simply to prove what is evident: citations in another work suggesting the existence of a book which actually exists. It is rather to argue that if Ibn Hishām's version of Ibn Ishāq's work had not survived we would still have been able to infer its existence from Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's repeated use of the *isnād* <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā'ī – Ibn Ishāq – Various informants>. Therefore, when we see other regular citations in FM which represent information from a particular earlier authority through the same repeated chain of authorities, we may at least entertain the possibility that these citations indicate the existence of a packaged body of historical material of a similar nature to Ibn Ishāq's *Sīra*. Other methods aside from *isnād*-scrutiny will of course be employed in the attempt to ascertain the nature of these packages, notably searching for parallel passages from the same source surviving in other texts, and inspection of medieval bibliographic texts such as Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* or Ibn Khayr's *Fahrassa*. Furthermore, I recognise that we will not be able to reconstruct these packages in a total manner. The following inspection of the material from the *Sīra* salvageable from FM will demonstrate the potential partiality of selection: behind the fifteen short citations of Ibn Hishām in FM lies a book which amounts to over 800 pages in the English translation. Nevertheless, in many cases it will prove possible to identify the perspective or interests of particular sources used by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam – at least on a given

¹¹ Guillaume, *Life of Muḥammad*. See his, *New light on the life of Muhammad* (Manchester, 1960) for comments on the Ibn Yūnus manuscript. For the papyrus fragment of Ibn Hishām, see N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic literary papyri I: Historical texts* (Chicago, 1957).

topic – and how he deploys these perspectives with reference to the rest of his narrative and the other perspectives which are available to him. Thereby we may begin to dispel some of the obscurity and woolliness in modern historiography regarding the agency and practice of early Islamic historians.

Before undertaking this task for the main packages of information used by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, however, we will first inspect closely his use of material from Ibn Ishāq in order to construct a model of his citation practice. The main issues to be inspected will be Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s use of verbatim versus paraphrase citation, the extent of his abridgement of his source material, the selection criteria for the reports, and the narrative purposes of these extracts within FM and how these agree or contrast with their roles in the *Sīra*. While there is of course no guarantee that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam approached all the bodies of information he was citing in the same manner, and lacking other extant sources for FM I will not be able to conclusively demonstrate how he was citing his other sources, this investigation will at least provide an approximate template for what Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was doing with his sources. As there are relatively few citations, I will go through them in turn, considering the above questions.

Ibn Hishām in FM: citation by citation

1. Treat the Egyptians well: Hagar, Ishmael, and the Copts

The opening chapter of FM recounts a series of injunctions from Muḥammad to his followers to treat the population of Egypt well on account of their having *dhimma*, the protected status

of those who had submitted by treaty to the Muslims, and *raḥim*, a genealogical relationship to the Arabs through the Arabs' supposed descent from the biblical Ishmael, the son of Abraham and his Egyptian concubine Hagar.¹² This is the first context in which the *isnād* <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā'ī – Ibn Ishāq> is cited. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam begins the chapter with an *isnād* leading to Muḥammad through the major Medinan scholar Mālīk b. Anas to al-Zuhrī, which tells us that Muḥammad said, 'When you conquer Egypt treat the Copts well, for they are owed protection and are kin'. The report continues with a question addressed by Ibn Ishāq to al-Zuhrī. 'Ibn Ishāq said: I said to Muḥammad b. Muslim [al-Zuhrī], "What is the kinship that the Prophet of God ṣ mentioned that they have?" He said, "Hagar, the mother of Ishmael, was one of them".'¹³ Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam then provides three further *isnāds*, each naming a different scholar who learnt this *Ḥadīth* from al-Zuhrī, the last of whom is Ibn Ishāq.¹⁴ The text of Muḥammad's statement is not reproduced on each occasion by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, who just gives the *isnād* and says that these scholars reported *mithlahu*, 'something similar'. The implication is that because all these different authorities were transmitting the same report from al-Zuhrī – and, ultimately, Muḥammad – their texts would have been close enough that they didn't need to be reproduced in full. The different *isnāds* demonstrate the reliability and stability of the report, given its transmission by some of the most important scholars in the Islamic world. I have not been able to find another text which produces this exact report on the authority of the first three scholars whom Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam claims

¹² FM 2-4.

¹³ FM 2, ll. 2-5.

¹⁴ The first and second are the Egyptian al-Layth b. Sa'd and Sufyān b. 'Uyayna, a Kūfan who settled in Mecca.

transmitted it from al-Zuhri.¹⁵ However, when we turn to the *Sīra* of Ibn Hishām, we find the report almost verbatim, including the exchange between Ibn Ishāq and al-Zuhri explicating the kinship of Egyptians and Arabs, with the only difference being the substitution of ‘the people of Egypt’ (*ahliḥā*) for ‘the Copts’ (*al-qibṭ*).¹⁶ As we have observed, the use of the ethnic label ‘the Copts’ instead of more neutral terms such as ‘the people of Egypt’ is a significant feature of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s text. For our purposes now, however, we may simply note that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s first citation of Ibn Hishām can be shown to be near-verbatim.¹⁷

The final question to address is the narrative contexts and significance held by this same report in the two different texts. Ibn Hishām’s version of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra* begins with the genealogy of Muḥammad, tracing it back to Adam and thereby genealogically writing Muḥammad into Judeo-Christian sacred history, to support the notion of Muḥammad’s message as the culmination of that sacred history. Ishmael is the link between a genealogy back to Adam familiar from the bible and a novel genealogy from the sons of Ishmael onward which establishes the genealogical interconnectedness of the tribes of Arabia and leads

¹⁵ i.e., which include <Mālik – al-Zuhri – etc>, <al-Layth – al-Zuhri – etc>, or <Ibn ‘Uyayna – al-Zuhri – etc>

¹⁶ IH 1/7.

¹⁷ The use of the term ‘Copt’ rather than ‘*ahl Miṣr*’ in FM may be because that was how Mālik – in contrast to Ibn Ishāq – transmitted the report, or may have been introduced by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, who was after all using this *ḥadīth* to introduce a section of his book explicitly about the Copts. As Mālik’s version of this *ḥadīth* is not extant, we cannot say. However, it is worth noting that elsewhere the same report is reproduced on the authority of an *isnād* to al-Zuhri through the Syrian jurist al-Awzā‘ī (d. 157/774) with a slightly different wording which does use the term Copt. See al-Ṭaḥāwī, *Sharḥ mushkil al-āthār* (Beirut, 1994), 6/136-7.

ultimately to Muḥammad. Ibn Hishām¹⁸ recounts the *Ḥadīth* under discussion after reporting the death and burial of Ishmael and before continuing with the line of Ishmael's descendants. Thus, he presents the injunction from Muḥammad to treat the Copts well not from any particular interest about the Copts but to adduce the *raḥim*, the kinship, between the Copts and Arabs, a proof of the descent of Muḥammad and the Arabs from Ishmael and Hagar. While the decontextualized significance of the *ḥadīth* is about determining correct Muslim conduct towards the Egyptians after the conquest (*astawṣū bi-him kahyran*), Ibn Hishām deploys it in order to verify his genealogy of Muḥammad with a *ḥadīth*.

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, by contrast, is not concerned in *The Conquest of Egypt* to establish Muḥammad's genealogy. Instead, he uses the *ḥadīth* to introduce a three-page section of different reports from Muḥammad stressing the need to treat the Egyptians well, claiming that they will be helpers for the Muslims, followed by a section on the merits of Egypt, many of which relate to its population of Copts. This leads to the beginning of the narrative section of the book which establishes the Copts' descent from Noah and describes their settling Egypt, the starting point for a continuous history of Egypt until the coming of Islam.¹⁹ If Ibn Hishām uses the 'protection-kinship' *ḥadīth* to tell us who Muḥammad is and tie him into Judaeo-Christian sacred history, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam is using it to introduce the Copts and tie

¹⁸ It seems likely that Ibn Hishām's arrangement follows Ibn Ishāq's, with some excisions and occasional interpolations and glosses. However, because we cannot be sure of this I will discuss Ibn Hishām's arrangement rather than Ibn Ishāq's, on the understanding that even if Ibn Hishām chose to totally follow Ibn Ishāq's sequencing, this was itself an arrangement. In any case, Ibn Hishām's version was what Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was working with.

¹⁹ FM, 2-10.

them into Muslim sacred history. With regard to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s citation-practice, it will simply be noted that as an author he was quite capable of excerpting material from his sources and re-using it in different contexts which served his own narrative ends.²⁰

A final point should be noted. The ‘protection-kinship’ *Ḥadīth* is the first prophetic *ḥadīth* recounted in both *The Conquest of Egypt* and the *Sīra*.²¹ Ibn Hishām’s book was arguably the most impressive historical work in circulation in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time. It is possible that by beginning his own book with the same words of Muḥammad but continuing it with the story of Hagar’s people and their land rather than the story of Ishmael’s people and their land, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was, amongst other things, nodding to the *Sīra* and presenting his own work as a complement to it.²²

2. Identifying Alexander

The section of FM dealing with pre-Islamic history ends with the conclusion of the last great Roman-Persian war and Heraclius’ dispatching a figure named al-Muqawqis to govern the province from the capital of Alexandria. This begins a seven-page excursus on Alexandria which opens with the identification of its founder, Alexander the Great, with the Koranic

²⁰ For further examples, see below, pp. 122, 132, 138-47, 236-40.

²¹ The description of the world which opens FM is given on the authority of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, while the *Sīra*’s genealogy of Muḥammad before this *Ḥadīth* has no authority beyond Ibn Ishāq.

²² The continuous history of Egypt occupies FM, 7-44. Ibn Hishām’s follows Muḥammad’s genealogy with a continuous history of the kings of Yemen and the southern Arabs, IH, 1/15-70, after which he recounts the story of the northern Arabs and matters relating to the stewardship of the Ka‘ba up to the birth of Muḥammad, pp. 1/71-158.

figure Dhū -l-Qarnayn.²³ After this, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam recounts the involvement of various figures in different construction phases of the city – Pharaoh, Moses, the mythical Egyptian queen Dalūka, Solomon, al-Khiḍr, Cleopatra, and finally ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ - and tells several legendary tales about the city. In the section identifying Alexander he cites Ibn Hishām or Ibn Ishāq (through Ibn Hishām) three times.²⁴ While these citations are interspersed in FM by text quoted from other sources, they all come from one continuous passage of the *Sīra*.²⁵

This passage comes from Ibn Hishām’s description of a series of attempts by Quraysh to undermine or neutralise Muḥammad, each of which fails and demonstrates his probity, divine protection, or prophetic knowledge²⁶. Firstly they make him an offer of kingship and riches on the condition that he stop spreading his message in Mecca, which he rejects. Secondly, an assassination attempt by Abū Jahl is foiled by the angel Gabriel in the form of a camel. Finally, Quraysh test him with three questions about ancient prophets or divine knowledge, fed to them by the Jews of Medina. The first question regards the story of some young men who disappeared. Muḥammad answers with the words revealed by God which would become the opening of the Koran’s *Chapter of the Cave*, which tells a version of the late antique story of the seven sleepers of Ephesus. The Koranic text is punctuated by an

²³ FM, 37-44.

²⁴ FM, 37 (twice), 39.

²⁵ IH, 1/308.

²⁶ IH, 1/295-308.

interlinear commentary from Ibn Ishāq supplemented with various glosses on obscure words from Ibn Hishām.²⁷

The lost boys riddle dispatched, Muḥammad proceeds to the second question posed by the Jews, that about a ‘great traveller’. In response, he recites a later section from the same Koranic chapter which begins with the line, ‘They will ask you [Muḥammad] about Dhū -l-Qarnayn’, and goes on to tell of Dhū al-Qarnayn’s travels from the place of the sunrise to that of the sunset and his confining of Gog and Magog.²⁸ Once a brief, non-Koranic précis of Dhū -l-Qarnayn’s career has been given, Ibn Hishām turns to his identity. This is the passage which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chooses to cite in FM, which in the *Sīra* reads:

<Ibn Ishāq – one who transmits from the non-Arabs what they inherited from the lore of [Alexander]>

Dhū -l-Qarnayn was an Egyptian called Marzubān b. Mardhuba the Greek (*yūnānī*), of the progeny of Yūnān b. Yāfith b. Noah Ṣ.

<Ibn Hishām>

His name is Alexander and it was he who built Alexandria. Thus it was named for him.

<Ibn Ishāq – Yazīd b. Thawr – Khālīd b. Ma‘dān al-Kalā‘ī, who was a man who encountered [Muḥammad]>

The Messenger of God Ṣ was asked about Dhū -l-Qarnayn and said, “He was an angel²⁹ who surveyed the earth from below with ropes.”

²⁷ Q 18:1-26. On the ‘Seven Sleepers’ myth in the Koran, see EI2, ‘Aṣḥāb al-Kahf’, EQ, ‘Men of the Cave’, and Sidney Griffiths, ‘Christian Lore and the Arabic Qur’ān: The “Companions of the Cave” in *Sūrat al-Kahf* and in Syriac Christian tradition’, in G. Reynolds (ed.), *The Qur’ān in its historical context* (Abingdon, 2008), pp. 109-37. Ibn Ishāq’s commentary on the verse, tying it into the events he has just recounted, is the kind of story which has led scholars to argue that the narrative of Muḥammad’s life in the *Sīra* is no more than a stitched-together patchwork of *asbāb al-nuzūl*, or occasions of revelation, an invented life constructed from plausible biographical contextualisation of Koranic passages.

²⁸ Q 18:83-98. See EQ, ‘Alexander’.

²⁹ The 1937 edition of al-Saqqā vocalises this as *malik* (king), though the 1955 edition which I am using opts for *malak* (angel), which is also how Guillaume translates it. This would make sense, because Ibn Ishāq immediately then gives a *khābar* which has the same companion tell a story in which the

<Khālīd [b. Maʿdān al-Kalāʿī]>

ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, God be satisfied with him, heard a man saying, “Hey, Dhū -l-Qarnayn!” ʿUmar said, “God, have forgiveness! Are they not content to name [their children] with the [names of] prophets, without naming [them] with the [names of] angels!?”³⁰

Ibn Ishāq does not appear to have identified Dhū -l-Qarnayn with Alexander or Alexandria, though his association with both Greece and Egypt are established, as well as alternative theories on whether he was a man or an angel. It is rather Ibn Hishām who provides a gloss saying that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was Alexander and that he built Alexandria.³¹

We see, therefore, that the identification of Alexander as Dhū -l-Qarnayn in the *Sīra* is an incidental feature of a section whose purpose is to explain the content and unity of a Koranic chapter, *The Chapter of the Cave*, by presenting it as a series of references to ancient stories (the seven sleepers, Alexander the Great) revealed to Muḥammad in response to questions posed to Muḥammad by the Jews and Quraysh in order to test his prophethood. Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam takes this exegetically-driven narrative and extracts what is useful to him, the identification of Alexander and Dhū -l-Qarnayn, in order to argue that the founder of Alexandria was a Koranic figure, and thus invest the city with a Koranic origin and glamour, a strategy which would become a trope of *faḍāʿil* literature.³²

orthography indisputably demonstrates that he thinks that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was an angel (by using the plural form *malāʾika*).

³⁰ IH 1/308.

³¹ For literature on the Islamic Alexander see above, p. 97, n. 161.

³² EI2, ‘Faḍāʿil’. For this technique applied to Damascus, see Paul Cobb, ‘Virtual Sacrality: making Muslim Syria sacred before the crusades’, *Medieval Encounters* 8.1 (2002), p. 46.

To this end, while citing Ibn Hishām verbatim, he rearranges the order in which his source presented the information about Dhū -l-Qarnayn and intersperses another report supporting his interpretation. Ibn Hishām’s identification had begun with Ibn Ishāq’s report that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was an Egyptian Greek called Marzubān. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, on the other hand, starts his chapter on Alexandria – vaguely citing ‘an Egyptian teacher’ (*shaykh min ahl Miṣr*) – with the statement that ‘the man who built Alexandria and laid the foundations for its construction was Dhū -l-Qarnayn the Roman. His name was Alexander and thus was Alexandria named.’³³ Instead of then contradicting this information with Ibn Ishāq’s statement that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was called Marzubān, he switches the order of the passage in the *Sīra* and first quotes Ibn Hishām’s gloss identifying Dhū -l-Qarnayn with Alexander. Next he inserts a report from a different source, which states that ‘it is Alexander who is Dhū -l-Qarnayn’.³⁴ Thus he firmly establishes what will be the basis for the forthcoming discussion of Dhū -l-Qarnayn – that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was indeed Alexander – by making an unattributed statement to that effect supported by two properly-cited authorities. Only then does he relate the contradictory identification from Ibn Ishāq as well as other reports claiming that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was a Libyan or a Ḥimyarite (south Arabian). Finally, he squares the circle and introduces the only extended narrative account that he actually has about the construction of Alexandria, an Egyptian story which describes Dhū -l-Qarnayn the Roman (*rūmī*) building

³³ FM 37.

³⁴ On the authority of a well-travelled Persian silk-trader named Wathīma b. Mūsā. For Wathīma, TI 5/959.

the city, ascending to the heavens supported by an angel to be divinely granted authority over the earth, and conducting campaigns to the furthest ends of the earth.³⁵

What emerges from this discussion of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s slight reordering of the passage he is citing from the *Biography*? The importance of the attempt to locate Alexandria within a Koranic sacred history has already been discussed.³⁶ The crucial thing we now take from this passage is that while it is true that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, as with most Arabic historians, cites historical reports which contradict each other, it is not necessarily true to say that we cannot discern his authorial position within these contradictions. In this case, it is obvious that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is proceeding on the basis that the historical Alexander and the Koranic Dhū -l-Qarnayn are the same character. If he did not think this, he would not have devoted three pages of his chapter titled ‘the construction of Alexandria’ to discussions of Dhū -l-Qarnayn.³⁷ Therefore this section can be analysed as an example of how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam makes an argument – and shows his authorial position – when he has contradictory information. The main features in this case are:

1. He makes a poorly attributed statement (from ‘an Egyptian teacher’) which presents his position.
2. He produces two properly cited reports which align with his position.

³⁵ FM 38-9.

³⁶ See above, pp. 97-103.

³⁷ FM, 37-40.

3. He cites three contradictory reports, no two of which are the same (Dhū -l-Qarnayn as Egyptian Greek, Libyan, or Ḥimyarite).
4. He produces an extended narrative which aligns with his position.
5. No narrative is produced which supports a position contradicting his own.

The deployment of the unattributed statement at the beginning creates a repetitive effect: the auditor of this text would hear that Dhū -l-Qarnayn was Alexander three times before hearing anything to the contrary. Furthermore, the effect has been manufactured. Rather than providing independent information, his unattributed first report simply paraphrases information which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam will subsequently cite with proper authority.³⁸ Nevertheless, by summarising his real reports into this first ghost-report from an unnamed *shaykh*, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam furthers the impression of multiple independent witnesses in consensus on one position, with the ghost-report lending spurious corroboration to the two properly attributed reports.³⁹ In contrast, the contradictory reports are all singletons. Thus they appear marginal and seem to cancel each other out. If doubt remained, any instability which has been introduced by the contradictory reports is then banished by a long narrative report which operates on the basis of Alexander being Dhū -l-Qarnayn. The original

³⁸ FM 37, ll. 14-15: ‘He who built Alexandria and laid the foundations for its construction was Dhū al-Qarnayn the Roman’, summarising the properly cited FM 39, ll. 1-3: ‘You came to ask about Dhū al-Qarnayn . . . a young man of the Romans . . . he built a city called Alexandria.’ FM 37, l. 15, ‘His name is Alexander and thus was Alexander named’ is a near-paraphrase of Ibn Hishām’s ‘His name is Alexander and it was he who built Alexandria. Thus it was named for him’, IH 1/308, excerpted at FM 37, ll. 16-17.

³⁹ This phenomenon is analogous, though not identical with, the potential cycle of circular reporting from Wikipedia which runs: 1) newspaper article cites an uncorroborated report from Wikipedia, 2) a reference to the newspaper article is added to the Wikipedia entry, 3) the originally uncorroborated report on Wikipedia now appears corroborated, through an unattested citation of itself.

contention is thereby reinforced and given a narrative context which makes sense of that interpretation by translating it into a memorable story, a reinforcement which is lacking for the alternative interpretations.⁴⁰ In conclusion, I suggest that close textual attention to the way in which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam arranges his reports on particular topics, with consideration given to the strategies we have seen deployed in this case, will allow us to unpick how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam advocates positions within contested debates without recourse to explicit editorialising in an authorial first person. In particular, I will examine other cases where weakly attributed ‘ghost-reports’ are used in tandem with properly attributed reports to guide the reader’s response to an issue, and whether phrases such as ‘a teacher from among the people of Egypt said . . .’ can be considered a vehicle for authorial interventions. I will also investigate whether extended narratives assuming one position in a debate are regularly used to implicitly comment on series of short, conflicted factual reports.

Finally, it is worth remembering the more general point that underpins this discussion. Rather than selectively quoting Ibn Hishām to support only the thesis that Dhū -l-Qarnayn is Alexander, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam also includes the report of Ibn Ishāq which suggests that he isn’t. He does not mine his source to produce a single perspective but, in this case at least, reproduces all the information he finds on the topic at hand. Thus, while the analysis I

⁴⁰ To borrow the language of the psychology of perception, the initial contention primes the auditor with Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s position, repetition creates an exposure effect developing the cognitive ease of the auditor’s accepting that position, and the position is finally embedded into a narrative, playing on humans’ natural tendency to remember and accept information presented as part of a plausible story. A summary and examples of these concepts can be found in Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow* (London, 2012), pp. 50–78.

suggest above renders an authorial position discernible, it is discernible within a framework which voices alternative interpretations. This shows that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is engaged in a relatively scholarly endeavour. Dissenting arguments are engaged with rather than obliterated, and what the author considers the most plausible is highlighted within the rhetorical constraints of the genre in which he was operating. This reflects the capability of early Islamic historians to accommodate uncertainty: the characteristic which traditionally led them to be viewed as undiscerning. This may be because many historical questions lacked or by their very nature could not have what legally trained historians like Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam viewed as the only definitive epistemological proof: a properly authenticated *isnād* of reliable transmitters to a prophetic statement, known from multiple independent witnesses. Given this mindset, historians may have been unwilling to select one account to the omission of another. It is possible also that in the relatively crowded scholarly milieu in which historians like Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam operated, exclusion of known historical reports might leave a historian open to criticism. Finally, it is also plausible that recounting various different opinions on a topic from a wide range of sources was a way for the teacher to demonstrate his breadth of learning, contacts, and scholarly excellence. The mastery of the source material displayed in narrating a recondite variety of alternative opinions would add to the scholar’s prestige. It might even, counter-intuitively, add rhetorical strength to the teacher’s own position, subtly indicated within that panoply of *ikhtilāf*, it being more convincing to acknowledge and refute an argument than to ignore it and appear ignorant.

3. Genealogical Information

On two occasions the *Sīra* is cited in FM in order to supply genealogical information about figures appearing in Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s narrative. The first occasions states:

<ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hishām – Ziyād b. ʿAbd Allāh – Muḥammad b. Ishāq>
The mother of al-ʿĀṣ b. Wāʾil was a woman of Balī.⁴¹

The significance of this is that al-ʿĀṣ was the father of the conqueror and subsequent governor of Egypt, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ. This citation is placed immediately after an attributed assertion that the Balī tribe were stationed on ʿAmr’s right during the battles of the conquest because of their kinship to him through his grandmother, as a properly cited proof of this relationship. It occurs in the section of FM devoted to the layout of the tribal quarters of the city, in the passage on the settlement of the Balī tribe. Once the topographic details of the tribe’s settlement have been given, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam recounts anecdotes of their significance in the history of Islamic Egypt. The quotation is excerpted from a passage in Ibn Hishām in which that same kin-tie is used to explain why Muḥammad sent ʿAmr to raise support among the Balī of Arabia in the raid of Dhāt al-Salāsil in AH 629:

The campaign of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ to Dhāt al-Salāsil, of the land of the tribe of ʿUdhra. In its report is that the Messenger of God ﷺ sent him to summon the Arabs to war in Syria. This was because the mother of al-ʿĀṣ b. Wāʾil was a woman of Balī. The Messenger of God ﷺ sent him to them to seek their friendship because of that.⁴²

Here Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam quotes Ibn Hishām–Ibn Ishāq verbatim to make the same point: that ʿAmr was able to leverage kinship ties through his paternal grandmother to obtain a military

⁴¹ FM 116.

⁴² IH 2/623. The ancestral lands of the Balī adjoined those of the ʿUdhra mentioned at the start of the report. On the raid, see Fred Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests* (Princeton, 1981), pp. 103–5.

following outside his own tribe of Quraysh. However, the explanation is being transferred from one historical moment to another, from Muḥammad's early campaigns to 'Amr's campaign in Egypt and the prestige accruing to different groups from their conduct therein. To that end, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam jettisons the surrounding text of the *Sīra* which related the comment to that historical context.

The second use of the *Sīra* for genealogical purpose comes during the part of the text devoted to post-conquest administration, from a section discussing those whom 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ deputised to run Egypt during his delegations to visit the caliph 'Umar. On one occasion, he puts a *mawlā* (non-Arab convert or client), Mujāhid b. Jabr, in charge of taxation. On hearing this, 'Umar notes the family to whom Mujāhid is client, and gives the epigrammatic utterance, "Lo, the pen raises its holder," a piece of *ḥikma* on the theme of bureaucratic skill trumping lineage in the achievement of status.⁴³ Ibn Hishām-Ibn Ishāq is then used to give a full thirteen-generation patrilineal genealogy of the family to whom the scribe is client, whom 'Umar has mentioned, a genealogy mentioned in the *Sīra* on three occasions on occasions when figures present at significant events of the birth of Islam are listed.⁴⁴ On this

⁴³ FM 179.

⁴⁴ IH 1/107, 324, 680. The fullest version, and the closest to that in FM is 1/324. The patron of this non-Arab client had a thirteen generation Arab genealogy, an alliance-tie (*ḥilf*) to Quraysh, was one of the Ethiopian emigrants, and had been at Badr. Mujāhid's patron was thus illustrious in both Islamic and non-Islamic terms, suggesting that it was not Mujāhid's penmanship alone which got him the job of tax-chief. This serves as an interesting vignette of the tension between the associations of inferiority with *mawlā* status and the opportunities and prestige clientage to a powerful individual might bring.

occasion Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is again mining the *Sīra* for genealogical data which allows him to situate the actors in his narrative within known genealogical and tribal structures.

4. The Generals Convert

Thus far we have seen Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam using the text of Ibn Hishām in various rather technical ways: providing a further citation to support a prophetic *ḥadīth*, proposing an Egypt-related identification for an obscure Koranic figure, and supplying snippets of genealogical information about characters in the narrative. This is a quite different phenomenon from the indiscriminate cut and paste approach to their sources identifiable in some contemporary historical chroniclers from Byzantium and the medieval west, whose products can resemble a Frankenstein’s monster of a history; whole sections from different texts bolted together into an incongruous whole unified by little but its chronological scheme.⁴⁵ In part this is simply because the basic content of the *Sīra* and the narrative Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam wanted to tell are rather different; FM being, as implied by its title, a story about Egypt, where the prophet never set foot. Therefore the *Sīra* does not contain much extended narrative content of relevance to his story, and is mostly quoted briefly and occasionally. In Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight, we will see in contrast how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used other sources more extensively to make up the backbone of his text.⁴⁶ However, there

⁴⁵ For Byzantine chronicles, J. Howard-Johnston, *Historical Writing in Byzantium* (Heidelberg, 2014), especially pp. 46-7. For an example of the bolted-together nature of these chronicles, see W. Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (2013), pp. 192-4, and p. 210 for an accidental inheritance of a particular agenda.

⁴⁶ See below, pp. 178-97, 208-21, 260-303.

are a couple of occasions on which he used Ibn Hishām to supply more extended prose passages, notably two accounts which describe the conversion of two of the generals who led the conquest of Egypt: ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ.

‘Ubāda’s story is a simpler case, so we will take it first. ‘Ubāda was one of the twelve *anṣār* – the Medinans who offered Muḥammad refuge from Meccan persecution – who first swore political and religious allegiance (*bay‘a*) to Muḥammad at a ceremony which became known as the First Pledge of ‘Aqaba in 621, before the *hijra*.⁴⁷ This was obviously a crucial moment in any history of the life of Muḥammad, as it was the institution of the Islamic community beyond Mecca, and the foundation of what would become Muḥammad’s state. Having listed which members of the different tribes of Medina made up the twelve pledgers, the *Sīra* cites a report through an Egyptian chain of scholars to ‘Ubāda, who recounts the terms of this first pledge:

< ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hishām – Ziyād b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bakkā’ī – Muḥammad b. Ishāq – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb – Marthad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Yazanī – ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Usayla al-Ṣunābiḥī – ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit >

I was among those who were present at the first [pledge of] ‘Aqaba. We were twelve, and we swore to the Messenger of God Ṣ in the manner of women⁴⁸ – for this was before warfare was ordained – that we would not partner anything with God, nor steal, nor fornicate, nor kill our children, nor bring forth slanderous accusations, nor disobey Him in what is known [to be good]. If you fulfil your vow you will have paradise and if you commit any of these things it is up to God, most mighty, most exalted, whether he wishes to punish you or forgive you.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ EI2, ‘al-‘Aqaba’.

⁴⁸ See Q60.12.

⁴⁹ IH 1/433.

This report provides further detail for the narrative of the *Sīra* and a set of commandments for the fledging Muslim community. The normative force of these commandments is suggested by the shift in the final sentence from first person reportage to a second person exhortation ostensibly by ‘Ubāda to his audience, but which would double as an exhortation to the reader/auditor of the account.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam relates this report in the final section of his work – in which he lists those companions who settled in Egypt and the traditions which the Egyptians related about them – as one of the *ḥadīths* associated with ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit.⁵⁰ It is no longer part of a chronologically progressing narrative in FM. Rather it is a means of highlighting firstly, the high status in Islam of one of the generals who led the conquest of Egypt through his presence at this important moment, and secondly, his transmission to the Egyptians of the charges laid by Muḥammad on his followers at the birth of his community. The quotation is absolutely verbatim, the only difference between the two passages being the dropping of a pious invocation, ‘most mighty, most exalted’, following the word God in the FM passage. This citation therefore shows that when he wished to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was able to achieve perfect replication of his source text for an extended passage.⁵¹

⁵⁰ FM 272.

⁵¹ Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam invokes alternative transmission lines at the end of the report, as further evidence for its genuineness, one of which is an alternative citation of Ibn Hishām-Ibn Ishāq, through al-Zuhrī. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does not provide the text of the alternative report, which is found in IH 1/434, and is practically the same with the addition of a line about it being better to suffer the punishment for one’s sins as penance in the world rather than at judgement day.

This should be taken into account when we read the second conversion story; that of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, the overall leader of the invasion of Egypt.⁵² In like manner to ‘Ubāda’s story, this occurs in chronologically ordered position in the *Sīra* but is cited by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam in his section of traditions reported by Egyptians about companions of Muḥammad who settled Egypt, this time ‘Amr. In contrast to ‘Ubāda’s story however, there is notable textual variation between the versions we find in the *Sīra* and FM. The two accounts are recognisably the same: the same events unfold in the same sequence, sentence-by-sentence, using the same vocabulary for the specific details of the story. However, synonyms are often used for common verbs – particularly of motion – in sentences which link actions in different places together; there are minor changes in syntax; occasional extra details, qualifications, or clarifications occur in one version or the other; and set phrases migrate from one position to another between accounts, or are indeed swapped around.⁵³ In effect, these differences

⁵² IH 2/276-8, FM 252-3.

⁵³ An example of each type of these shifts may be neatly observed in the following parallel passages, in which ‘Amr, taking sanctuary at the court of the Ethiopian Negus, imagines to his companions Quraysh’s positive response if he asked the Negus to hand over Muḥammad’s envoy so that ‘Amr could kill him.

FM: *qultu [‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ] hadhā wa-llāhi ‘Amr b. Umayya qad ba‘athahu Muḥammad wa-law qadimtu bi-hadāyāya ilā -l-Najāshī thumma sa’altuhu iyyāhu fa-a‘ṭānīhi fa-qatalthuhu fa-ra’at Quraysh annī qad ajza’tu hīna yuqṭal rasūlu Muḥammad.*

IH: *qultu li-aṣḥābī hadhā ‘Amr b. Umayya al-Ḍamrī law qad dakhaltu ‘alā -l-Najāshī wa-sa’altuhu iyyāhu fa-a‘ṭānīhi fa-ḍarabtu ‘unuqahu fa-idhā fa’altu dhālika ra’at Quraysh annī qad ajza’tu ‘anhu hīna qataltu rasūla Muḥammad.*

The passage in FM gives the extra information about Ibn Umayya that he had been sent by Muḥammad to the Negus, whereas Ibn Hishām gives Ibn Umayya’s *nisba* as extra information. The verbs of entrance to the Negus’ presence are different synonyms, and FM has ‘Amr imagine himself giving the gifts he has brought, unmentioned in IH. The key phrases of ‘Amr asking the Negus to hand over Ibn Umayya and of Quraysh seeing that he had done his part are identical, yet there are minor variations in ‘Amr’s purpose to alternatively ‘kill’ or ‘behead’ Ibn Umayya, the doubled protasis (*idhā fa’altu dhālika* as well as *hīna qataltu rasūla Muḥammad*) in IH’s version of the final conditional sentence, and FM’s use of a passive verb in that protasis. In the wider context of the extract, we see that the opening oath – *wa-llāhi* – of the FM account occurs at the beginning of ‘Amr’s

resemble what you would expect between two oral retellings of a well-established and much-repeated story, the progression and crucial terminology of which was fixed in the teller's mind, with the exact articulation differing slightly between retellings.

Given that we have just seen Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam recount a report from Ibn Hishām verbatim, these hallmarks of a woollier oral transmission might seem surprising. However, these divergences can be easily explained without concluding that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam is here transmitting more loosely from Ibn Hishām. In this case, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam not only cites his usual *isnād* to Ibn Ishāq, i.e. <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā'ī – Ibn Ishāq>, which he shares with our extant text of the *Sīra*, but also the *isnād* <Asad b. Mūsā – Yaḥyā b. Abī Zā'ida – Ibn Ishāq>. Given Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's scrupulous citation of Ibn Hishām elsewhere, we are justified in thinking that the divergence between the versions of this story in FM and the *Sīra* are because Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was using Asad b. Mūsā's text, based on a differently worded recitation of Ibn Ishāq to Yaḥyā b. Abī Zā'ida.⁵⁴ Asad b. Mūsā (d. 212/827-8) was an Egyptian scholar and a

previous sentence in IH. The killing/beheading disparity is swapped around when 'Amr later actually addresses the Negus with the speech he here imagines; thus both accounts include 'Amr using the phrase that he will 'kill' and 'behead' Ibn Umayya at different points; they have merely been swapped between his imagined and actual speech.

⁵⁴ Such minor variations between texts of the *Sīra* based on different transmitters from Ibn Ishāq are common (termed different *riwāyāt* from Ibn Ishāq). See, for an example, the variations on this report from Ibn Ishāq cited in Ibn Sa'd's *Ṭabaqāt*, 1/171. Al-Ṭabarī usually cites Ibn Ishāq through <Ibn Ḥumayd – Salama>, and his versions show similar minor incongruities indicative of different oral retellings of the same story: for the story of 'Ubāda see TT, 2/356, where the additional line ascribed by Ibn Hishām to al-Zuhrī's report, mentioned in the footnote above, is combined in the account from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb; 'Amr's Balawī ancestry in al-Ṭabarī results in his dispatch to summon the people (*nās*) rather than the Arabs (*'arab*) to Syria, c.f. TT, 3/31 and IH 2/623; the story of 'Amr's conversion under discussion finds its parallel in TT, 3/29-31, which closely parallels that in IH, 2/276-8. In general, of course, the relative closeness of these variations between the *riwāyas* of Ibn Ishāq mean we can be confident that our later recensions give us something near to the content of the

main informant for certain parts of FM. He had journeyed to the central Islamic lands where he presumably learned this report from Yaḥyā (d. c. 182/798-9).⁵⁵ Like al-Bakkāʾī, Yaḥyā was based in Kūfa, but must have either heard a different recitation by Ibn Ishāq or transcribed the same recitation differently. Alternatively, it may have been the transmission by Asad b. Mūsā which introduced these slight divergences. Rather, therefore, than concluding that this passage indicates sloppy quotation on the part of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, it seems probable that we once again encounter a stringent textual citation-practice on his part.

Thus, detailed analysis of the text shows that, in this observable case, the addition of an extra *isnād* authorising the report can be shown not to be a simple justificatory prop but an actual guide to Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's scholarly practice, indicating the fact that he had two independent sources for this story. This will be borne in mind when we see paired or triplet *isnāds* in general in FM: they will be understood to indicate genuine use of multiple sources transmitting parallel reports.

It is also worth considering whether or not Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam signals which of his sources he is using as the verbatim basis of the *khbar* he reproduces. In this case Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam lists the <Asad – Ibn Abī Zāʾida> *isnād* before <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkāʾī>. This can be contrasted

historical material which he brought together. A study of these differences is provided by S. al-Samuk, 'Die historischen Überlieferungen nach Ibn Ishāq. Eine synoptische Untersuchen' (PhD dissertation, University of Frankfurt, 1978), who stresses the variations.

⁵⁵ For Asad: TI 5/275-6; TKAR 2/512-4; HM 1/346; TKB 2/49; ITK 2/126-7; SAN 10/162. More on him below, pp. 205-6, 222-33. For Yaḥyā, TI 4/1000. We can see that it is this Yaḥyā from the list of transmitters of from Ibn Ishāq and to Asad at TKAR 2/513, 24/210.

to the report about ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit discussed previously in this section. In that case Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does also list an alternative to the <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā’i – Ibn Ishāq> *isnād* for the report, citing also <‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ – al-Layth b. Sa‘d – ‘Uqayl b. Khālīd – Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī – ‘Ā’idh Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī – ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit>. However, on that occasion he listed the Ibn Hishām *isnād* first, and as noted above, the text he reproduces is identical to that found in the Ibn Hishām version of the *Biography*. Given that we only have two secure examples here, the conclusion must be highly provisional, but it does appear that when citing multiple *isnāds* for the same report Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam name the source he used as the basis of his text first.

The final question to be addressed is, given that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam happily quotes from <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā’i – Ibn Ishāq> on multiple other occasions, why did he chose to use Asad b. Mūsā’s text rather than Ibn Hishām’s here? There is no real difference in content or narrative effect between the versions, so a stylistic or polemical motivation can be ruled out. One alternative would be that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam only had access to a portion of Ibn Hishām’s text. While he knew that this story was contained in the *Biography*, and so could cite it, he did not have this part of the text to consult and so used Asad’s version. However, his citations of the *Sīra* are spread throughout Ibn Hishām’s text, at vol. 1, pp. 5, 7, 77, 107, 307-8, 381-2, 433, 506, 680, and vol. 2, pp. 276-8, 304, 623 of the modern edition. This breadth of citation from within Ibn Hishām’s text suggests that he had access to the whole book and made his selection based on what he found relevant, rather than being restricted by having a partial copy. Furthermore, this passage was taken from vol. 2, pp. 276-8, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was able

to successfully cite a nearby passage from Ibn Hishām at vol. 2, p. 304, making it unlikely that he did not have access to a section of text only twenty-six pages distant in the modern edition. This does not rule out the possibility that this section of text was somehow defective in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s copy of the *Sīra*, through damage or loss of folios for example, and that he used Asad’s version to make up for it. A final possibility is that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had Ibn Hishām’s version of this passage but considered Asad b. Mūsā a better source for some reason, and therefore used his version. Asad b. Mūsā is one of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s most frequently used authorities, being cited almost seventy times in FM according to my count.⁵⁶ He may therefore have preferred to use Asad, as his more regular source. In any case, we can assume that Asad did not transmit a full *riwāya* of Ibn Ishāq’s *Biography* from Yaḥyā b. Abī Zā’ida, or we would expect it to be cited elsewhere in FM. Nor is Ibn Abī Zā’ida known to be a transmitter of the *Sīra* from other sources.⁵⁷ This demonstrates how even when a scholar such as Ibn Ishāq packaged a *khbar* such as this one into a larger body of material, they might also transmit these *khbars* separately, or alternatively their students might extract individual *khbars* from a taught package and transmit them in different contexts. Thus, as noted earlier in this section, we should imagine both ‘packaged’ and ‘atomised’ transmission of *khbars* occurring simultaneously, rather than assuming that one process or the other was prior.

⁵⁶ See appendix.

⁵⁷ See Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, xxx, listing known *riwāyas* from Ibn Ishāq. Also, A. Kudelin, ‘Al-*Sīra al-Nabawiyya* by Ibn Ishāq – Ibn Hishām: The History of the Texts and the Problems of Authorship’, *Manuscripta Orientalia* 16 (2010), pp. 6-12.

5. The other Coptic woman

So far we have seen Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam excerpt snippets of Ibn Hishām’s text to provide genealogical or individual identifications, or quote more extended passages verbatim. The final example we will look at demonstrates another type of excerption; extended citation of a passage but with the editing out of context, details, and repetitions which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam judged to be superfluous to his purposes. The passage in question comes at the outset of FM’s conquest narrative, when the Roman leader of Egypt, al-Muqawqis, recognises Muḥammad’s prophethood and gifts him, amongst other things, two or more high-ranking young women (*jāriyas*). Muḥammad takes as concubine one of these women, Maria, who bears him a son.

Now, however, we will examine the identity of the other woman, as Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam quotes Ibn Hishām in order to establish her identity. In the four narrative accounts of al-Muqawqis’ offerings in FM, his gifting these women is always mentioned. In one version they are both unnamed and no further information is given;⁵⁸ in another it is specified that one of the two, who remains unnamed, is the mother of Muḥammad’s son Abraham;⁵⁹ in another it is specified that they are two sisters and that Muḥammad marries the one called Maria;⁶⁰ and in the final version there are three women, relation unspecified, and Maria is named as the mother of Abraham.⁶¹ The fact that Muḥammad has a child by one of these women is clearly

⁵⁸ FM 47, l. 10.

⁵⁹ FM 47, l. 14.

⁶⁰ FM 48, l. 18.

⁶¹ FM 49, ll. 8-9.

fundamental to this information, being included in three of the reports, and her name, Maria, is found in two of the four accounts. The identity of the other women, however, is pretty opaque, though each version which tells us that Muḥammad married one of the women discusses who was given the other(s), showing us that Muḥammad's rewarding his followers with the other woman was also an important part of the story. Only one account tells us that the women were sisters. It is clear that this is because in that account al-Muqawqis' gifts to Muḥammad are a prophetic test. The women's being sisters is a part of this test: al-Muqawqis declares that the previously-foreseen prophet would not have sex with two sisters and Muḥammad fulfils this by re-gifting the second sister to another man despite being enamoured with both, thereby proving his status.⁶² In none of these narrative accounts are the other women named, and the only detail we have about any of them (that one is Maria's sister) seems to be a trope establishing Muḥammad's prophethood through his fulfilment of Christian foreknowledge of the characteristics of the final prophet.

Rather than leave the identity of the other woman obscure, however, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam presents a couple of anecdotes, unrelated to the envoy to al-Muqawqis, which claim implicitly that she was indeed Maria's sister, she was called Sīrīn, and that she was given to Muḥammad's court-poet Ḥassān b. Thābit and later bore him a son 'Abd al-Raḥmān. As part of this aside Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam adduces a report from the *Sīra* as evidence for this. This report opens with an altercation between two Muslims in Medina; a Meccan 'emigrant' (*muhājir*),

⁶² FM 48, ll. 15-16 for the declaration; Muḥammad's fulfilment at p. 49, ll. 2-6.

Ṣafwān b. al-Mu‘aṭṭal, beats Ḥassān b. Thābit, a Medinan ‘helper’ (*anṣārī*), half to death with his sword. Another Medinan captures Ṣafwān, binds him, and drags him away – presumably to face summary justice – but is induced to allow Muḥammad to arbitrate the dispute. Muḥammad diffuses the embryonic feud between his Meccan and Medinan followers by persuading Ḥassān to waive his right to retribution. As reward he gifts Ḥassān an estate and a Coptic slave-woman (*ama qibṭiyya*) called Sīrīn.⁶³

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam clearly positions this anecdote as the explanation of why Muḥammad gave Maria’s sister to Ḥassān. He opens the sequence of reports with a *khbar* which mentions the four different potential husbands to whom the other woman sent by al-Muqawqis might have been given.⁶⁴ Then he relates a prophetic *ḥadīth* whose *isnād* and content imply that Ḥassān b. Thābit had his son ‘Abd al-Raḥmān by a woman called Sīrīn, who was the sister of the mother of Muḥammad’s son Abraham, i.e. Maria.⁶⁵ Finally, he introduces this text which describes a Coptic slave-woman called Sīrīn being given to Ḥassān.⁶⁶

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam selected these reports from different sources. His direct informant for the reports are all different: Asad b. Mūsā, al-Naḍr b. Salalam, and Ibn Hishām. None of the transmitters in any of the *isnāds* are common, showing that both the generation and transmission of these reports were independent and that it is Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam who

⁶³ FM 48, IH 2/304-6.

⁶⁴ FM, 47, ll. 11-16.

⁶⁵ FM 47, l. 17 – 48, l.1.

⁶⁶ FM 48, ll. 2-12.

juxtaposed them. Each describes entirely different events (the al-Muqawqis envoy, the death of Muḥammad, and an intra-Muslim dispute in the mid-Medinan period). This is a prime example of how our author weaves together originally unrelated information from diverse origins on different topics to develop an authorial position. The rhetorical constraints of *isnād-khabar* history-writing forbade him from simply stating, ‘the sister of Maria, whom al-Muqawqis gave to Muḥammad, was called Sīrīn. She was married to Ḥassān b. Thābit and bore his son ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān’. Instead they insisted that he relay his proofs without synthesising an overt conclusion.

To return to the citation of Ibn Hishām, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s quotation practice is slightly different here than in the cases we examined regarding the generals’ conversion. Rather than reproducing the excerpt from Ibn Hishām in full, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam condenses his source text. He does this in part through suppression of extraneous detail or dialogue, in part through excising the frame-story for the fracas. First, the details: in the *Sīra* we are told that Ṣafwān is being dragged off as a prisoner ‘to the estate of the tribe of al-Ḥārith b. al-Khazraj’, a line Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam omits. The FM version also drops full names and replaces them with pronouns, assuming the reader will follow who is saying or doing what and to whom, producing the endless sea of pronouns so beloved of the novice Arabic reader. Also, certain narrative effects are dropped from the text. When Muḥammad is persuading Ḥassān to forgive his assailant in the *Sīra* he has to repeat his request twice, adding to the dramatic tension as Muḥammad strives to defuse the explosive situation. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam simply has him state the request, to which Ḥassān acquiesces. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is not interested in

the narrative drama or details of this episode, rather he functionally progresses through the minimum retelling required to arrive at the point where *Sīrīn* the Copt is given to Ḥassān.

While Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam reproduces a condensed version of Ibn Hishām’s text of this anecdote, he feels no obligation to remain faithful to the contextual meaning it had in the *Sīra*. This is most apparent in the abrupt manner in which the anecdote begins in FM, with Ṣafwān attacking Ḥassān without any explanation as to why he does so. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam has omitted both the wider and the immediate frame stories for this event provided by the *Sīra*, which are that 1) Ṣafwān had recently been cleared, by Koranic revelation, of being involved in a sexual scandal with the prophet’s wife ‘Ā’isha, regarding which Ḥassān had been one of the main rumour-mongers. This incident is presented in the *Sīra* as a coda to that story.⁶⁷ 2) The altercation occurred as an immediate result of Ḥassān’s reciting a poem satirising the ‘vagabond immigrants’ from Mecca, of whom Ṣafwān was one. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam excises both Ḥassān’s attack-poetry and Ṣafwān’s couplet on assaulting him, memorably translated by Guillaume as ‘Here’s the edge of my sword for you!/ When you lampoon a man like me you don’t get a poem in return!’⁶⁸ Without these contexts provided in the *Sīra*, the story as it appears in FM springs from nowhere and appears as an ahistorical trope of Muḥammad’s judicious arbitration, rather than an illustration of the barely suppressed tension between the Meccans and Medinans of Muḥammad’s coalition around the time of the ‘Ā’isha scandal. Redaction practices such as this, producing apparently illegible

⁶⁷ And likewise in al-Wāqidi, MW 2/436-8.

⁶⁸ Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, p. 498.

discrete narrations, contribute to the impression of confusion or corruption in the Arabic historical tradition, and analyses of a discontinuity in Arabic memory of the origins of their community. However, in this case at least, we can be sure that while the Ṣafwān-Ḥassān narrative appears in FM unmoored of the narrative contexts which provided its 'original' meaning, and lacking the key details which make it a coherent story, this unmooring is not through defective practices of transmission or accidental forgetting. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam certainly had access to the full story as told by Ibn Hishām, and presumably understood its significance there. However, the reason for which he told it in his text – as a proof in a discussion about which of Muḥammad's followers he rewarded with the gift of a woman from the same stock as his own concubine – meant that he did not need to reproduce it fully, resulting in what appears at first glance to be a defective tradition.

This is not to say that these instances of incoherent traditions are not difficult for the modern historian to deal with, nor to deny that these re-appropriations of historical anecdotes do not disturb the stratigraphy of the soil from which positivist historians seek to sift an objective account. Rather, it is to reject the paradigm of confusion which is sometimes invoked to explain the nature of early Arabic historical memory. We should not automatically seek to explain the reformation, even the deformation, of Arabic narratives of early Islam as a result of confusion, but through the active agency of Muslims and others using the past in the context of their own times. An elliptical version of a story may, as in this case, have been the result not of misunderstanding but the specific use of that story in a particular textual context which did not require coherent historical narration. Furthermore, we need to

remember the partiality of survival which determines our access to Arabic historical memory. Hyper-condensed narrations may well have stood in inter-textual relationship with now non-extant texts in which it had been appropriate to recount fuller versions. Common knowledge, a difficult historical phenomenon to trace but a very real one, may have rendered 'defective' texts perfectly intelligible. Factors such as these must be taken fully into account before modern readers project their own confusion onto the authors of the works which they are trying to read.

As stated, this argument is not being pursued in order to defend positivist readings of the Arabic sources as accurate representations of the events they recount. Rather, this part of the investigation into FM is intended to establish as firmly as possible the methods of a ninth-century historian working within the Arabic historico-legal tradition in order to provide a case study of how information was redacted and transmitted by the people who control our access to literary accounts of the origins of Islam. One of the key challenges of early Islamic historiography, as I see it, is to understand how history was reconstructed within a society which was remembering its past, was doing so according to the rules of its own episteme, and how that remembering changed the past. One difficulty in reconciling this is how, within the textually conservative tradition being observed, new details accrued, which allowed later accounts of early events to be more detailed than earlier accounts. In places this must be a result of sheer invention, or the natural embellishments of story-telling when such informally-generated information fed into the more formal historical tradition here

represented by FM. However, the case of Sīrīn gives us an example of how, even within the formal and conservative tradition, details could accrue without recourse to invention.

Our starting point here is that according to Ibn Hishām's account it is impossible for Sīrīn to be the other slave woman gifted to Muḥammad by al-Muqawqis. In the *Sīra* the Ṣafwān-Ḥassān debacle happens as part of the scandal following the false accusations against ʿĀ'isha. This occurred after she went missing on the return from the raid against the Banū Muṣṭaliq, which happened before the aborted pilgrimage of al-Ḥudaybiya.⁶⁹ However, according to both Ibn Ishāq and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, the envoys which Muḥammad sent out to the rulers of the world, including the one that resulted in al-Muqawqis' gifts to Muḥammad, occurred specifically 'in the period between al-Ḥudaybiya and his death'.⁷⁰ Therefore according to Ibn Hishām's chronology Sīrīn was given to Ḥassān before Muḥammad received any gifts from al-Muqawqis, and thus could not have been Maria's sister. Ibn Hishām himself never suggests a link between the Sīrīn of the Ḥassān-Ṣafwān story and the women sent by al-Muqawqis from Egypt. Therefore, it seems that as Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam scraped together as much information as he could about matters pertaining to Egypt from authoritative sources, he sometimes made connections which didn't make sense according to his sources. The stories

⁶⁹ See the transition between the ʿĀ'isha affair and the Ḥudaybiya pilgrimage, IH 2/308. Al-Wāqidi agrees, see MW, 2/436-8.

⁷⁰ Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, p. 653. Reconstructed from the citation in al-Ṭabarī. While this detail was dropped in the extant version of Ibn Hishām's recension, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used the same chronological frame, saying the mission to al-Muqawqis occurred 'when it was the sixth year from the emigration of the messenger of God Ṣ and the messenger of God Ṣ had returned from al-Ḥudaybiya'. FM 45.

he had about al-Muqawqis dispatching unspecified other women as well as Maria – including one that made the other woman Maria’s sister – invited exegesis. A *ḥadīth* report existed from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān b. Thābit in which his mother Sīrīn recalled wailing with her sister on the death of Muḥammad’s son Abraham, though the identity of the sister and her relationship to Muḥammad and the child is not made clear.⁷¹ Finally, he had a report explaining that this Sīrīn, the mother of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān, was a Coptic slave-woman given to Ḥassān by Muḥammad. It seemed sufficiently neat to combine these reports to explain the presence of this Sīrīn in Muḥammad’s entourage as being because she was one of the women (presumably but not explicitly ‘Copts’) sent to Muḥammad by al-Muqawqis, and the reference to Sīrīn’s sister in the *ḥadīth* report as because her sister was Maria, the mother of the child they were lamenting. Nevertheless this is a connection completely absent from Ibn Hishām and impossible by the chronology of the *Maghāzī*-writers.⁷² Furthermore, the variety of claims about who married the second woman (Jahm b. Qays, Muḥammad b. Maslama, Diḥya b. Khalifa) as well as the fact that there existed in Egypt at least two alternative identifications of Maria’s sister – Ibn Lahī‘a’s reports that she was called either Qayṣarā or Ḥanna⁷³ – should make us wary of assuming that the Ḥassān-Sīrīn version is simply factually accurate and Ibn Hishām’s chronology is the problem here. Rather, this reconstruction illustrates a process of traditionist historical-knowledge-construction which,

⁷¹ FM 47. C.f. al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Muḥjam al-Kabīr* (Cairo, 1994), 24/306 and TT, 11/617.

⁷² It should be noted that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam may be reflecting earlier interpretations here, as in one version of the ‘al-Muqawqis’-gifts’ report which states that the second woman was given to Jahm b. Qays he states several alternative views on the recipient including that it was Ḥassān b. Thābit. FM 47, ll. 14-17.

⁷³ FM 52, ll. 17-20.

at least by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time, was rather like a jigsaw in which the pieces had been established and had now to be fitted together, occasionally with judicious use of scissors. The idea that the other woman sent by al-Muqawqis was the Coptic maid Sīrīn whom Muḥammad gave to Ḥassān was preferable to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam because several details corresponded with the surrounding pieces of the al-Muqawqis’-gifts story, even if the chronological shape of the piece didn’t quite fit. At this point we might reconsider Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s excision of the frame-story for the Ḥassān-Ṣafwān debacle as being not only a matter of concise focus on the salient information for the point he was making. It also appears to be a conscious attempt to unmoor this story from a chronological frame which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam knew undermined the interpretation which he was using the details of the story to prove.

By the time of al-Ṭabarī, however, the image of al-Muqawqis’ gifts was no longer just a patchwork of small pieces of detail jammed together. Rather some pieces appear engineered to produce a seamless account:

Al-Muqawqis, the master of Alexandria, sent to the Messenger of God ﷺ in the year seven of the *hijra* Maria and her sister Sīrīn, along with 1000 *mithqāls* of gold, 20 supple robes, his she-mule Duldul and his donkey ‘Ufayr – also pronounced Ya‘fūr. With them was a eunuch called Mābūr, an old man who was the brother of Maria.⁷⁴

In this report all the elements are known, named, and securely chronologically located, in contrast to the vagueness of FM’s reports on the gifts. We see clearly the process in which later Arabic traditions claim to know more detail than the earlier. The dubious accretions,

⁷⁴ TT, 11/617.

such the detail about *Sirīn* which we observe Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam engineering, have become fact.

The idea that al-Muqawqis sent Muḥammad such unprestigious riding beasts as a mule and a donkey may again have originally functioned in the stories about al-Muqawqis’-gifts as a prophetic test; one part of al-Muqawqis’ vision of the prophet-to-come was that he would ride a donkey. As in the case of the other Coptic woman, this may have been combined with initially unrelated information in the historical tradition, here about the names of Muḥammad’s steeds. For example, al-Wāqidi knew that Muḥammad rode a she-mule called *Duldul*, though made no connection between *Duldul* and the envoy to al-Muqawqis.⁷⁵ The eunuch whom al-Ṭabarī names is a central character in a story about Maria’s suspected adultery related in FM – though not by either Ibn Hishām or al-Wāqidi – but the eunuch’s name was unknown to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s sources, nor was he mentioned in FM’s accounts of al-Muqawqis’ gifts.⁷⁶ One suspects that his presence among the gifts and his name are again details which accrued later to solidify the instructive story about Maria’s suspected adultery.

This final example of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s citation of Ibn Ishāq is clearly more complex than the others, and has led us into something of a rabbit-warren. To conclude, we have here yet another case of a narrative being reused to make a different point than it served in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s source. What distinguishes this instance from the previous examples is that here

⁷⁵ MW, 2/815, 3/897.

⁷⁶ FM 49.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is citing a narrative for a piece of information that was incidental to its original purpose. In this case he does not just take the meaning of a story and place it in a different narrative context to make a different point, but shifts the focus onto a detail of secondary importance in the original story (that Muḥammad gave Ḥassān a Coptic slave-woman called Sīrīn). Thus, he retools the entire meaning of the story. This leads to a rather different quotation practice than observed in the other cases; here Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam cuts not only the frame stories which gave the anecdote an explicable context but also significantly condenses his source text, leaving a story with no standalone historical sense. Furthermore, we see him juxtaposing this story with several other reports in order to implicitly argue that the people being discussed in them (the woman gifted by al-Muqawqis, the Sīrīn gifted to Ḥassān by Muḥammad, the Sīrīn at Abraham's grave) are the same and to therefore fill in details left vague by the original, relatively blank narration of al-Muqawqis' gifts. However, we see that in the process of eliding these separate bodies of information Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam has created an account which is chronologically incoherent according to the sequence of events suggested by him, his source, and other *Maghāzī* experts such as al-Wāqidī. Moreover, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam appears to have covered his tracks by removing the chronological markers from the Ḥassān-Ṣafwān story which demonstrate that the Sīrīn given to Ḥassān couldn't have originally been a gift from al-Muqawqis. This novel elision of details

from separate sources has been successful enough to survive and become a detailed, unified report apparently from a single source in al-Ṭabarī.⁷⁷

It is worth noting, also, that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s relation of these anecdotes to each other is not achieved in order to score a polemical point. It might well have been worthwhile for ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān and his descendants to argue that Sīrīn was Maria’s sister and therefore claim a kinship affinity to Muḥammad. However, the reports used to justify this claim do not come from a family *isnād*, and it is hard to see why Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam would have had a dog in this race. Rather, the motivation for this reworking of information was to demonstrate a fuller knowledge of the events of early Islam. An account which in its earlier forms seems to be designed to make more mythic points, such as Muḥammad’s fulfilment of pre-ordained criteria of prophethood and the recognition of his status by the Christian authority al-Muqawqis, become factualised by the provision of specific details lacking in their earlier incarnations. Furthermore, in the hands of the legal scholars who compiled the texts through which we mostly access Arabic historical information, originally narrative information is legalised; treated as evidence or proof, sometimes in contrast to its original literary, mythic, or polemical functions.

6. Quoting Ibn Hishām

⁷⁷ It should be noted that there is no indication that the al-Ṭabarī report is reliant on FM, suggesting again that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s reading is representative of a wider re-understanding and integration of these anecdotes.

Thus far, we have been inspecting Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s citations of Ibn Ishāq in FM, which as noted he received through the *riwāya* of <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā’ī>. However, the text we have of the *Sīra* includes not just Ibn Ishāq’s information as transmitted by Ibn Hishām, but also Ibn Hishām’s glosses on that information, a fact obscured to the casual reader of the translation by Guillaume’s relegation of these glosses to an appendix in his translation.⁷⁸ As we saw in the ‘Identifying Alexander’ section above, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam cites Ibn Hishām’s glosses in FM as well as the text attributed to Ibn Ishāq. A brief consideration of how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam cites these will tell us both about how Ibn Hishām’s version of the *Sīra* was perceived and used by its scholarly readers, and about Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s citation practice when dealing with glosses interwoven into a packaged body of material by its *rāwī* (transmitter). The patterns we observe will help us to identify and analyse his citation of glosses appended to other packages of information which he used to construct FM, which may tell us something about who put these packages together and when.

⁷⁸ Guillaume described Ibn Hishām’s contribution to the text as ‘impertinent meddling’, Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, p. xli. It is in fact unlikely that there was a stable ur-text to ‘meddle’ with, or for Guillaume to reconstruct. On the complicated authorship of the *Sīra* see A. Kudelin, ‘Al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya by Ibn Ishāq – Ibn Hishām: The History of the Texts and the Problems of Authorship’, *Manuscripta Orientalia* 16 (2010), pp. 6-12, Gregor Schoeler, *Ecrire et transmettre dans les débuts de l’islam* (Paris, 2002), translated and revised as *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: From the Aural to the Read* (Edinburgh, 2009), and Harald Motzki, ‘The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: The case of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf’, in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003), pp. 174-5. Guillaume himself later recognised that he had ‘failed to do justice to Ibn Hishām’s work as an editor’ and that ‘we owe much to Ibn Hishām for his painstaking efforts to introduce some sort of logical and chronological order into the narrative’ of the *Sīra*, once he had been confronted with Yūnus b. Bukayr’s *riwāya* of Ibn Ishāq’s work. Alfred Guillaume, *New light on the life of Muhammad* (Manchester, 1960), p. 8.

Ibn Hishām is directly cited six times in FM with no further link in the *isnād* chain. The glosses cited explain how the Amalekites fit into humanity's descent from Noah, identify Dhū -l-Qarnayn as Alexander, and give onomastic information for early Muslims who are mentioned in both the *Sīra* and FM. Every one of these citations can also be found in the *Sīra* as we have it in the *riwāya* of Ibn Hishām, where they are also explicitly attributed to Ibn Hishām with no further link in the *isnād*.⁷⁹ This shows us that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam is not simply using Ibn Hishām sloppily as shorthand for <Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā'ī – Ibn Ishāq>, but is preserving a distinction between Ibn Hishām and Ibn Ishāq's information which was present in his source. Furthermore, it shows us that everything which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam claimed to have on Ibn Hishām's authority was part of the packaged text which was transmitted in the manuscript tradition of Ibn Hishām's *riwāya*. Thus, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was not quizzing Ibn Hishām about Ibn Ishāq's text or issues of relevance to his own interests, but rather utilising a set of glosses that Ibn Hishām had made part of a fixed text of the *Sīra*. The complete absence in FM of any information from Ibn Hishām which did not become part of the manuscript tradition of the *Sīra* raises the possibility that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam did not in fact study directly with Ibn Hishām, but simply had access to a written version of his *Sīra*. This is despite the fact that Ibn Hishām was present in Egypt at a time when Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam had begun collecting information that would end up in FM, that he spent time with al-Shāfi'ī – who was closely associated with the Banū 'Abd al-Ḥakam in Egypt – and that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam uses the term

⁷⁹ FM 12 (= IH, 1/77), 37 (=IH 1/307), 53 (=IH 1/680), 94 (=IH 1/506), 107 (=IH 1/381-2), 286 (=IH 1/506).

ḥaddathanī ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hishām, suggesting oral transmission.⁸⁰ On balance, it seems more likely that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did in fact attend sessions in which Ibn Hishām taught the *Sīra*; he may simply not have wanted to or not had the opportunity to get additional comments or information from his teacher.

In only one case of the six does Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam quote the glossed text of Ibn Ishāq along with Ibn Hishām’s gloss. Thus, quotations of Ibn Hishām mostly appear in FM with no mention of Ibn Ishāq, despite their originally being glosses of his *Sīra*. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam therefore seems to have viewed Ibn Hishām’s testimony on issues raised by Ibn Ishāq’s text as authoritative information in itself, beyond its application to the aspects of the *Sīra* which Ibn Hishām was explaining. This is interesting for what it suggests about how a scholar’s utterances became authoritative within an Islamic culture of knowledge which was transitioning in the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries from one which was primarily oral to one which was primarily textual. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does not transmit just anything Ibn Hishām had to say about history, but he transmitted what Ibn Hishām had to say about Ibn Ishāq’s text. It was Ibn Hishām’s role as a knowledgeable transmitter of an important text which allowed him to speak authoritatively in his own voice, without an *isnād*, on issues of

⁸⁰ Ibn Hishām spent his latter years in Egypt where he died in either 218/833 or 213/828, and was thus in Egypt a contemporary of some of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s main informants (e.g. Asad b. Mūsā, d. 212; ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, d. 214; ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, d. 219). For Ibn Hishām’s life, see *EI2*, ‘Ibn Hishām’, which does not mention his meeting al-Shāfi‘ī. For this, see e.g., *TI* 5/387, or *HM* 1/531, where we learn they recited poetry together. For al-Shāfi‘ī’s association with the Banū ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, J. Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and his major compendium of jurisprudence* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 27-33. For Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s use of *ḥaddathanī* with Ibn Hishām, see e.g. FM 12, 37.

relevance to that text. This shows a certain level of flexibility operating at the edges of the traditionist-historian epistemology of the *isnād*. It suggests that this epistemology could allow for certain individuals' becoming sources of authority in themselves, so long as they did so in a way which was thoroughly implicated in practices of properly authenticated transmission of information between teachers and students. This encourages us to read single-name *isnāds* in FM not as cases in which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam randomly decided that his informant was competent to generate historical knowledge, but to investigate whether these apparently improperly validated utterances were in fact originally authorised by their being made in the context of authoritative processes of transmission and textual compilation.

The example of Ibn Hishām indicates that one such process would be glossing a packaged text. The implication for our understanding of how other packages of information might appear in FM is that the presence in FM of a curtailed *isnād* (e.g. <ḥaddathanī scholar A>) to a figure transmitting what we suspect to be a package of information, repeatedly cited with the same *isnād* (e.g. <ḥaddathanī scholar A – scholar B – scholar C – various>), may indicate not only a figure who transmitted and glossed that package of information, but perhaps also a figure who was important in re-packaging and reforming it, just as Ibn Hishām glossed, re-packaged, and reformed Ibn Ishāq's *Sīra*. Finally, the occurrence of a curtailed *isnād* in FM unrelated to an occurrence of the repeated package-*isnād* does not mean that the curtailed-*isnād* report was not originally a gloss on that package.

7. Beyond Ibn Hishām

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, Ibn Hishām's *Sīra* is the only text – apart from the Koran – that we find quoted in FM which is extant in the form in which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam accessed it. As such, we can closely compare these two texts to draw firm conclusions about the way Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam used the *Sīra* when composing his own text. I argue that these conclusions can be generalised to stand for his general practice when using his sources. It is, however, worth trying to test whether these conclusions are more widely applicable. Beyond Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's citations of Ibn Hishām, it is possible to observe cases where we find him quoting a source which also appears to be the origin of a passage quoted independently in another text. An assessment of the closeness of these parallel citations can be used as a rough control on the conclusions we have drawn from the *Sīra* material and, if the text attributed to the common source is consistent in both independent witnesses to it, a means of establishing a *terminus ante quem* for the circulation of that report in the lifetime of the 'common link'. The next chapter will do this systematically for a body of *ḥadīths* which Ibn Ishāq learned in Egypt, comparing their form in FM with their instantiations in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal's *Musnad*. Of course, these parallel citations are a less concrete guide to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's citation practice than the material he took from the *Sīra*. Lacking his source-text, we can not know where these reports occurred in the source in which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam accessed them, and thus cannot comment on his transferal of them from one narrative context to another. Furthermore, any divergence between the report as found in FM and the other extant instance of it could be the result of alterations to the text in the course of the common report's transmission to the other witness. However, allowing for minor divergences introduced over the course of transmission, these cases I have found of common passages

found in FM and another text do in fact support the notion that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was faithfully reproducing his sources when he quoted them in FM.

FM contains two long reports about the end of the last Roman-Persian war which are recounted with different *isnāds* leading to the final part of the citation-chain < al-Zuhrī - ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUtba - Ibn ʿAbbās > . Both of these reports can be found independently attested in other texts with *isnāds* which lead to the same chain from Al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742). In both cases the texts – while not exactly verbatim – are clearly the same passages, following the same progression of events and ideas, displaying common use of key vocabulary, and containing no significant divergences.⁸¹ We observe similar cases, with even closer correspondences, in fourteen reports about the treaty-implications of the conquest of Egypt which can be found in both al-Balādhurī's *Conquest of the Lands* (*Futūḥ al-Buldān*) and FM. Al-Balādhurī never cited FM, rather he had access to these Egyptian traditions through alternative lines of transmission whose common *isnad*-links with the reports in FM are generally transmitters who died in the second half of the second/eighth century.⁸² Again, these parallel passages show Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam rigorously preserving the form and wording of the reports which he included in FM.

⁸¹ Compare FM 34, ll. 9-19 with TMD 1/378-9, and FM 35, l. 5 - 37, l. 11 with MT 3/301-4 and TMD 1/374-7. See my longer discussion of his use of these texts below, pp. 234-6.

⁸² See the discussion and reference to these common reports below, pp. 159-77.

However, there is one text which seems to show Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam altering the wording of his source material. FM’s pre-Islamic history contains an account of Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion of Egypt which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam reproduced on the authority of Wathīma b. Mūsā.⁸³ This account is closely paralleled in an extant manuscript which claims to be Wathīma’s son’s version of his father’s teachings. Wathīma’s son’s manuscript is a little garbled, but clearly contains a text derived from the same account.⁸⁴ However, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s version of the story gives the anonymous Egyptian ruler of Ibn Wathīma’s account a name which agrees with FM’s pre-Islamic Egyptian king-list, and adds a couple of passages which spell out the consequences of Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion for Egypt and the Egyptians.⁸⁵ It seems quite unlikely that Wathīma’s original account contained these elements but his son’s version omitted them. As such, it appears that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam amalgamated Wathīma’s account with other information he had about pre-Islamic Egypt to make a kind of combined report, which then indicated by his citation of Wathīma ‘and another’ (*wa-ghayruhu*) rather than just Wathīma. While this instance contradicts what we have observed in the case of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s fifteen citations of Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra*, there are several reasons to believe it is an exceptional case. Firstly, it is the only such instance of apparent textual alteration by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam in all of the cases I have looked at, including the fifteen securely comparable citations of Ibn Hishām discussed in this chapter, the sixteen

⁸³ FM 31-2.

⁸⁴ R. Khoury, *Les légendes prophétiques dans l’Islam depuis le I^{er} jusqu’au III^e siècle de l’hégire. D’après le manuscrit d’Abū Rifā‘a ‘Umāra b. Waṭīma, K. Bad’ al-ḥalq wa-qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*. Avec éd. crit. du texte (Wiesbaden, 1978), pp. 268-272.

⁸⁵ For a full illustration and discussion of the differences between the two accounts see below, pp. 247-52.

independently attested reports mentioned in the previous paragraph, and the twenty-one independently attested *ḥadīths* I inspect in the next chapter. Secondly, we cannot be sure of the form of Wathīma's original report, given that we only have his son's version of it, and a garbled one at that. It may be that Wathīma had taught different versions, one of which included a name for the Egyptian king and the fate of the Egyptians, or that Wathīma's son had edited these aspects out of his version. Thirdly, it is clear that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam did not routinely replace references to anonymous Egyptian rulers in his sources with names derived from his king-list. His king list provided proper names for each of the Egyptian rulers who interacted with Abraham, Joseph, and Moses.⁸⁶ However, when Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam relates accounts of these prophets from other sources they are simply referred to as the king (*al-malik*) or Pharaoh (*Fir'awn*). This strongly suggests that in those cases Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam did not rationalise his source-text to agree with his other information about these events, as we would expect from his observable practice with regards to Ibn Hishām's *Sīra*. I discuss the possible reasons for the exception in the case of the Nebuchadnezzar story below, pages 252-4. For now, we may simply conclude that this one possible case of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's textual amalgamation does not undermine the majority of cases which demonstrate that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's general practice of composition was one of faithful reproduction of the wording of the texts he was quoting, even as he deployed them in narrative contexts which might alter their function or meaning.

⁸⁶ See the provision of these names at respectively FM 10, ll. 4-5; 13, ll. 3-4; 19, l. 13 – 20, l. 2.

Chapter Five:

Alexandria, 733: The Umayyad origins of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s information

The previous chapter focussed on Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical practice through his citation of Ibn Hishām’s extant recension of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*. In it, we observed that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam preserved the wording of Ibn Hishām’s text closely even as he contextualised it within quite different narratives, thereby bringing out different meanings within the passages he excerpted. In terms of the wider aims of this section – to establish whether and how FM’s *isnāds* can be used as a guide to the circulation of historical information in Egypt before his time – it could be objected that this only tells us about Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s practice in the early-to-mid-third/ninth century. Can Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s generally rigorous and textually conservative historical procedure be assumed for the generations of Egyptian scholars before him who appear in his *isnāds* and provided the information we find in FM?

While some modern historians are quite happy to accept that our third/ninth century compilations do contain earlier material, and indeed some argue that some of it is genuine first/seventh century information, it is worth at least briefly inspecting whether it is possible to prove that the information in FM can be dated to an earlier period, and if so how early.⁸⁷ The first point to make is that the material in FM from the *Sīra* – inasmuch as we are willing to accept that Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra* represents material transmitted by Ibn Ishāq, which is fairly

⁸⁷ The most in-depth argument for genuine seventh century material being A. Görke and G. Schoeler, *Die ältesten Berichte*.

conclusive given the similarities of the content if not the arrangement of the material in the different *riwāyas* from Ibn Ishāq – dates at least to before 150/767 when Ibn Ishāq died. If we accept Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s transmission of *Sīra* material as a general model for the historical information found in FM, this suggests that his *isnāds* bring us at least to material genuinely being transmitted in the form we find it in FM in the first half of the second/eighth century. Again, it could be objected, however, that Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra* was exceptional, that it achieved a proto-book status at an earlier stage than other bodies of information, and therefore the material it contained and the citations recording its transmission were better preserved than for other historical information. Further, the earlier transmission of Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra* happened in Iraq.⁸⁸ Even if rigorous transmission methods can be deduced from the common material found in different *riwāyas* of the *Sīra* transmitted in Iraq, we might still be wary of assuming that these practices were also current in Egypt.

However, the dismissal of Egypt as a backwater in the development of Islamic law and related scholarly practices, largely based on the relative absence of Egyptian scholars in the legal literature which emerged in ninth-century Iraq and various points east, has been strongly challenged. Recent work has argued that Egypt was the cradle for the development of the Mālikī and Shāfi‘ī legal schools. Manuscript finds from North Africa have shown that the development of more stable Arabic written texts occurred in Egypt as early as elsewhere, if not earlier, and important early transmission of the Medinan scholar Mālik’s texts and legal

⁸⁸ Guillaume, *Life of Muḥammad*, p. xxx.

responsa occurred in Egypt.⁸⁹ Thus, we should not assume less rigorous processes of transmission by Egyptian, as compared to Iraqi, scholars.

Nevertheless, it seems best to test whether the non-*Sīra* material found in FM can be seen to have passed through similarly rigorous modes of transmission. In order to do this, I will compare a sample body of *ḥadīths* which can be found in both *Futūḥ Miṣr* and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal's *Musnad*. Aḥmad's *Musnad* records various *ḥadīths* whose *isnāds* claim that they had been learned by Ibn Ishāq from the Egyptian scholar Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb. The Arabic biographical tradition remembers Ibn Ishāq as having studied with Yazīd in Alexandria in 115/733-4.⁹⁰ Aḥmad's *isnāds* subsequently trace their transmission by Iraqi scholars. In *Futūḥ Miṣr*, these *ḥadīths* appear verified by purely Egyptian chains of transmission back to Yazīd. We will see that both Aḥmad and Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam retain broadly the same texts, even as these reports passed for over a century through independent chains of transmission in Iraq and Egypt, with sufficient divergence to suggest natural yet minor changes over the course of transmission rather than disguised mutual reliance on a common source.

⁸⁹ See Jonathan Brockopp, 'The Formation of Islamic Law: The Egyptian School 750-900', *Annales Islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 123-40, for a maximalist view of Egypt's sophistication and importance and references to Muranyi's important manuscript discoveries from Tunisia. See Ahmed El Shamsy, *The Canonization of Islamic Law: A Social and Intellectual History* (New York, 2013), particularly pp. 91-146 for the Egyptian context to Shāfi'ism.

⁹⁰ SAN 7/47, TKAR 24/424 agree on this date, both quoting the lost Egyptian biographical dictionary of Ibn Yūnus (d. 347/958). The article on Ibn Ishāq in EI2 places his sojourn in 119 but I cannot find this date in a medieval source. The EI2 article is probably following al-Zirikli's, AZ 6/28, which seems to be mistaken, perhaps influenced by the error in Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* (Hyderabad, 1326 AH), v. 9, p. 44, which places the event in 199AH!

Ibn Ishāq's transmissions from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb in Ahmad's *Musnad*

In the last chapter, we considered Ibn Ishāq solely in relation to the *Sīra* material which Ibn Hishām later transmitted to Egyptian scholars once he settled there. However, Ibn Ishāq had himself travelled to Egypt and learned *ḥadīth* there, which he then brought back and taught in the Islamic east. These reports give us some leverage with which to test the textual rigour of Egyptian scholars operating before our extant texts such as FM. It is worth placing this moment in the context of Ibn Ishāq's life, as a case study of how 'travel in pursuit of knowledge' (*al-riḥla fī ṭalab al-ʿilm*) could cross-fertilise legal and historical traditions from different parts of the early Islamic world. Ibn Ishāq was born in Medina in 85/704 and became famous for his learning, particularly on the matter of the prophet's campaigns. In 115/733-4 he spent time in Alexandria where he studied under some of the senior scholars of Egypt before returning to his homeland. At some point after this he left Medina for Iraq, apparently to escape his disputes with other Ḥijāzī scholars including the prominent jurist Mālik b. Anas. In Iraq, Ibn Ishāq seems to have sought the patronage of members of the new ruling dynasty, the ʿAbbāsids, in provincial capitals, before settling in the imperial capital Baghdad. During the peregrinations of his later life, Ibn Ishāq taught his *Sīra*. As we have seen, the most commonly known transmissions of this text emerged from this Iraqi period of his life.⁹¹ We have seen how Ibn Hishām brought this text to Egypt in the early third/ninth century. However, Ibn Ishāq was not solely an authority on *maghāzī* material, but also *ḥadīth* of more

⁹¹ EI2, 'Ibn Ishāq'.

specifically legal significance. Guillaume went as far as to claim that Ibn Ishāq authored a written work of *Sunan*, sayings and doings of the prophet, based on a reference by the eleventh/seventeenth century Ottoman scholar Ḥājjī Khalīfa.⁹² However, no similar reference to a book of law by Ibn Ishāq can be found in the medieval bibliographical works of Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 385/995), Ibn Khayr (d. 575/1108), or Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449), or any biographical traditions about Ibn Ishāq, suggesting that Ḥājjī Khalīfa may in fact have been referring to a later compilation of Ibn Ishāq's scattered legal *ḥadīth*.⁹³ As we will see, a third/ninth century scholar like Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal does not use a consistent *riwāya* to Ibn Ishāq's legal material, supporting the idea, derived from the earlier bibliographers, that his *ḥadīth* were transmitted in atomised rather than packaged form, unlike his *Sīra*.

A number of the legal *ḥadīth* circulated in the Islamic east by Ibn Ishāq were those he had learned in Egypt in 115/733-4. By testing these against the texts of versions of the same *ḥadīth* which were transmitted within Egypt, we can draw some conclusions supporting the stringency of the transmission of legal reports within Egypt from at least the period 115/733-4 onwards. The scholars who transmitted these legal reports in Egypt were largely the same scholars who were transmitting the historical reports which would end up in FM. While it is true that these scholars probably treated historical reports with less caution than prophetic *ḥadīth*, it is also likely that if their *isnāds* indicate conservative textual practice for one body of material they are not entirely fictive for another.

⁹² Guillaume, *Life of Muhammad*, p. xiii.

⁹³ *FIND*, 200. *FIK*, 1/87.

As noted, Ibn Ishāq did not leave us a neatly collected body of legal *ḥadīth* transmitted in Iraq against which we might test the parallels in FM. Instead, I have inspected all of the *ḥadīth* transmitted by Ibn Ishāq from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/745-6) which I can find in the *Musnad* of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) and seen whether corresponding reports can be found in FM. Aḥmad's *Musnad* is a vast collection of *ḥadīth* containing approximately 27,700 *ḥadīth*, almost four times as many as the canonical Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ*; thus, it is a good place to go hunting for enough reports to make a decent comparison.⁹⁴ Yazīd was recognised by his contemporaries as the most important Egyptian legal scholar of his day, the first to institute proper study of religious science in Egypt.⁹⁵ As such, Ibn Ishāq transmitted many reports from him, many of which ended up in Aḥmad's *Musnad*. Forty-two separate *isnāds* are found in the *Musnad* containing the *isnād*-link < Ibn Ishāq – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb > .⁹⁶

Half of these forty-two *isnād*-chains verify *ḥadīths* which can also be found in FM.⁹⁷ However, six of these are only known in FM through Ibn Ishāq's transmission. That is, Ibn 'Abd al-

⁹⁴ For an introduction to the place of Aḥmad's *Musnad* within Islamic legal scholarship see Jonathan Brown, *Ḥadīth: Muhammad's legacy in the medieval and modern world*, p. 30; in the context of his life, Christopher Melchert, *Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 39-48; and its composition, *idem*, 'The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: How it was composed and what distinguishes it from the six books', *Der Islam* 82 (2005), pp. 32-51.

⁹⁵ See TI 3/562, 563, for two parallel statements to this effect ascribed either to second/eighth century scholars, or the fourth/tenth century Egyptian biographer Ibn Yūnus, who preserved much earlier Egyptian biographical material.

⁹⁶ MA 2/146, 226; 11/78; 13/37; 23/267; 27/281; 28/199, 525, 526 (twice), 561, 563 (twice), 564, 585 (twice), 586, 611; 29/312, 569, 579; 35/22 (twice), 25; 37/415; 38/165, 475, 517, 518, 555; 39/148, 361, 385, 438, 442, 444, 483; 44/12, 343; 45/201, 206, 221.

⁹⁷ The bracketed references provide the location of the corresponding traditions in Aḥmad's *Musnad*. FM 97 (MA 45/201), 104 (MA 39/442, 444), 231 (MA 28/526, 586), 252-3 (MA 29/312), 259-60 (MA

Ḥakam's knowledge of these six traditions of the Egyptian Yazīd derived from Ibn Ishāq rather than indigenous processes of transmission from Yazīd.⁹⁸ The fact that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam does not transmit these reports with entirely Egyptian lines of transmission, given that recounting *ḥadīth* transmitted by Egyptian scholars is his ostensible intention in the *ḥadīth* section of FM in which they are found, suggests that either the Egyptian scholars after Yazīd had forgotten them or perhaps they had been falsely ascribed to Yazīd by Ibn Ishāq.⁹⁹ Either way, they give us reason again to trust Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's citation practice. It would have been extremely easy for him to attach these *ḥadīths* from Yazīd to one of the many *isnāds* which he had connecting himself to Yazīd, and therefore claim these traditions as being entirely transmitted by Egyptian scholars. Instead, by accepting the veracity of these *ḥadīth* he effectively admitted that the Egyptians had forgotten these traditions taught by their

39/442, 444), 266-7 (MA 44/343), 272 (MA 37/415), 278 (MA 39/361, 385), 279 (MA 28/199), 282 (MA 28/526, 45/201), 288 (MA 28/525, 585[twice]), 292 (MA 28/563[twice]), 293 (MA 28/526, 586), 295 (MA 28/526, 611; 45/201), 303 (MA 29/569), 306 (MA 39/438), 310 (MA 27/281). Multiple reports are sometimes found on the same page, explaining why there are not twenty-one page-references.

⁹⁸ These include two reports from Yazīd which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam learned from Ibn Hishām as part of the Iraqi-transmitted *Sīra*; two reports which he got from an Egyptian-born son of a soldier from Marw (modern Turkmenistan), who had learned them whilst studying at Hārūn al-Rashīd's court in Raqqa (modern Iraq); and a report which he learned from a Palestinian scholar who in turn got it from another scholar from Marw who was based in Baghdad.

The two reports at FM 252-3, 272, are from the *Sīra* (Ibn Hishām – al-Bakkā'ī – Ibn Ishāq). FM 231, 293 are from < 'Alī b. Ma'bad – 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Amr al-Jazarī – Ibn Ishāq > . 'Alī b. Ma'bad's father must have been a soldier of the 'Abbāsīd revolution, and therefore part of the *abnā' al-dawla*, who eventually settled in Egypt, his status suggested by the fact that his son 'Alī had studied under Hārūn al-Rashīd's chief judge al-Shaybānī in the caliph's house alongside the princes of the realm, TI 5/407-8, SAN 10/631-2 for a clearer version of the same story. For 'Ubayd Allāh, see TI 4/688, where he is al-Raqqī rather than al-Jazarī, but must be the correct individual based on the reference at TKAR 19/138. FM 310 is transmitted through < Mahdī b. Ja'far – Ibn al-Mubārak – Ibn Ishāq > . See TI 5/704 for Mahdī, who was from al-Ramla, and EI2 'Ibn al-Mubārak'. On FM 295 we find a partial *isnād* with no intermediate connection between Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and Ibn Ishāq.

⁹⁹ For his explicit commitment to reproducing *ḥadīths* with Egyptian lines of transmission, FM 248, discussed in ch. 9.

great predecessor Yazīd. Thus, while these *ḥadīth*'s presence in FM adds further ballast to our positive assessment of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's citation-scruples, they cannot be used as an external control on the Egyptian tradition.

In one case Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam includes one of Yazīd's *ḥadīth* known to Aḥmad via Ibn Ishāq both via an external transmission through Ibn Ishāq and through an Egyptian line of transmission.¹⁰⁰ This would appear to undermine the hypothesis that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam systematically preferred Egyptian lines of transmission in his *musnad*. However, it seems rather that he included Ibn Ishāq's version only in order to point out an error in it and therefore prove that the Egyptian's knew their own tradition better than he. As Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam wrote, 'Ibn Ishāq disagrees regarding this with [the Egyptian scholars] al-Layth and Ibn Lahī'a, but in this matter they are more knowledgeable.'¹⁰¹

The remaining fourteen cases, however, show Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam transmitting from Egyptian informants a *ḥadīth* which Ibn Ishāq had apparently learned from Yazīd in 115/733-4 and which had then been transmitted in the east, ultimately to Aḥmad. Overleaf I provide a translation of one of these matching reports as found in each text, spaced so the

¹⁰⁰ FM 282, repeated at 295.

¹⁰¹ FM 295: the dispute is that 'Ibn Ishāq transmits [the following *ḥadīth*] with the same *isnād* from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Juhānī . . . but in fact it was from Abū Baṣra.' Aḥmad's transmissions of this report from Ibn Ishāq show Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is correct in his accusation. See MA 28/527, 29/581. Though Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam would not have known it, an external Medinan witness to Yazīd's version of this *ḥadīth* preserved in Aḥmad's *Musnad* suggests that the Egyptians were right and Ibn Ishāq had it wrong, Yazīd did transmit it from Abū Baṣra. See MA 45/211.

corresponding text is side by side, to give an example of the kinds of similarities and differences between these parallel *ḥadīths*.

FM 303	MA 29/569-70
< ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 214/829-30), Abū al-Aswad al-Naḍr b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār (d. 219/834-5), and Hānī’ b. al-Mutawakkil (d. 242/856-7) (all Egyptian) – Ibn Lahī’a (d. 174/790-1, Egyptian) – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/745-6) – Abū al-Khayr (d. 90/708-9) – Daylam al-Jayshānī (d. ?) > He [Daylam] said: I came to the Messenger of God ﷺ and said, “Oh Messenger of God, we are in a greviously cold land (<i>bi-arḍin bāridatin shadīdati -l-burd</i>). We make there (<i>naṣna‘u bi-hā</i>) a drink from wheat. Is that permissible, oh Prophet?” He [Muḥammad] said, “Is it not intoxicating?” (<i>a-laysa yuskir</i>) He said, “Of course.” (<i>balā</i>) He said, “Then it is forbidden.” (<i>fa-innahu ḥarām</i>) Then he returned to him a second time and he [Muḥammad] replied similarly (<i>qāla mithlahā</i>). Then I repeated this and said to him, “What is your opinion if (<i>a-ra’ayta in</i>) they refuse to take their leave of it (<i>an yada‘ūhā</i>) oh Prophet of God, when I am master over them [<i>wa qad ghalabtu ‘alayhim</i>]?” He said, “Whoever you are master over, kill him.”	< Muḥammad b. ‘Ubayd (d. 203/818-9, Kūfan)¹⁰² – Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 150/767, Medinan) – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb – Marthad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Yazanī [a.k.a. Abū al-Khayr]¹⁰³ – Daylam al-Ḥimyarī [Jayshān is a sub-tribe of Ḥimyar] > He [Daylam] said: I asked the Messenger of God ﷺ and said, “Oh Messenger of God, we are in a cold land where we exert ourselves in grevious toil (<i>bi-arḍin bāridatin nu‘ālīju bi-hā ‘amalan shadīdan</i>). We prepare (<i>nattakhidhu</i>) a drink from this wheat with which we are strengthened in our deeds and against the cold of our country.” He [Muḥammad] said, “Is it intoxicating?” (<i>hal yuskir</i>) I said, “Yes.” He said, “Then avoid it” (<i>fa-jtanibūhu</i>). He said, then I came before him (<i>jī’tu min bayna yadayhi</i>). I said to him the same thing (<i>mithla dhālik</i>) and he said, “Is it intoxicating?” I said, “Yes”, and he said, “Then avoid it.” I said, “The people are not going to give it up.” (<i>inna -l-nāsa ghayru tārikīhi</i>) He said, “If they don't leave it, kill them.”

¹⁰² Al-ṬNAFSY, see TKAR 24/410 for his relating from Ibn Ishāq. TKB 1/173 for his date, though MUA 1/274 places his death in 205.

¹⁰³ See, e.g. TI 2/1004, for Marthad b. ‘Abd Allāh’s *kunya*, Abū -l-Khayr.

It should be noted that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and Aḥmad report independent transmissions to themselves from Yazīd, yet the same transmission from Yazīd back to Daylam, the narrator of the story, making Yazīd the ‘common link’ for both narrations.¹⁰⁴ Aḥmad was reportedly taught Ibn Ishāq’s report by an Iraqi, while all of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s direct and indirect informants are Egyptian. While both name the same informants from Yazīd to Daylam, they use different forms of their names, suggesting that onomastic information might be reworked to make sense depending on the context of transmission, even while accurate memory of the person being represented was retained. Thus, in Egypt everyone knew who Abū al-Khayr was, whereas in Iraq his name, patronymic, and tribe had to be specified. The story itself progresses in exact parallel, though synonymous formulations are often used (e.g. two different verbs for preparing/making are used; the prohibition is given respectively in a statement and an imperative), and Aḥmad’s text includes extra non-essential details (e.g. ‘where we exert ourselves in greivous toil’). Thus, the FM version seems a touch more juristic than narrative; these colourful, explanatory details are lost and Muḥammad is asked an opinion in legal formula (‘Is that permissible . . . What is your opinion if . . .’). The FM version is also slimmed down, avoiding a narrative repetition (‘I said to him the same thing’) by relating the repetitious middle section in a curtailed form in the third person (‘he returned to him’), rather than the first person in which the account began. The FM version is, however, slightly expanded at the end with the condition that Daylam should kill only those he had

¹⁰⁴ On *ḥadīth* terminology see G. Juynboll, ‘(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in *ḥadīth* science’, *Islamic Law and Society* 8 (2001), pp. 303–49. The ‘common link’ is a fundamental part of Motzki’s method.

power over. Despite these divergences, it seems clear that these differences are ones which could naturally accrue from the retelling of a story, perhaps even by the same narrator in different contexts, and that the essential similarity of the narrative progression and the identical key vocabulary (*arḍ bārid*, *sharāb min qamḥ*, *hal/a-laysa yuskir*) demonstrates a common ultimate origin for both versions.

The simplest explanation of this common origin is that which the *isnāds* describe: the teaching of Yazīd. Variations would then accrue either in Yazīd's different narrations to Ibn Lahī'a and Ibn Ishāq, or in the course of subsequent transmission from them. The fact that we know of no connections between Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and Aḥmad, and the fact that they were operating contemporaneously in locations about 1,000 miles distant from each other, supports the notion that these are independent witnesses to Yazīd's transmission. Further, the variations between the two accounts speak against the scenario of a forged transmission story attached to an account from a common textual source; systematic forgery of minor textual differences as we can observe between the two reports would not have been an effective strategy in a culture of knowledge which saw deviations in accounts as a problem rather than a sign of authentic oral of transmission. One might argue that both versions could stem from a late, invented story ascribed to < Yazīd – Abū al-Khayr – Daylam > and circulated orally, explaining the oral-looking differences between the versions, and with different *isnāds* being forged in Iraq and Egypt. However, it should be noted that in common reports that Aḥmad and Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam ascribe to Yazīd, they each use a variety of *isnāds* to get back to Yazīd. In the forgery scenario, both scholars would have had to systematically invent

numerous different *isnāds* to connect to this body of forged material, while both opting to keep the same *isnād* connecting Yazīd to his sources.

To compare all the corresponding reports in this detail would be unnecessary, but see the following footnotes for references illustrating further the nature of the divergences between analogous reports. The general pattern is that while there is some variation between the *matns* in FM and the ones found in Aḥmad's *Musnad*, in all cases they are recognisably the same story with minor variations in set-up (frame-story given or not), vocabulary (synonyms used), gloss (whether obscure terms are explained or not), and some abbreviation.¹⁰⁵ The versions preserved in FM are regularly more abbreviated than those in Aḥmad's *Musnad*. The fact that this is consistent throughout the reports suggests that this is a trend rather than simply the random result of fluidity of oral transmission, although the aforementioned synonym-variation does suggest that there was an element of fluidity in the transmission. Whether this is due to redaction on the part of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam or accretion on the part of the reports which ended up in Aḥmad's *Musnad* would be hard to determine without a systematic *isnād*-cum-*matn* analysis of these fourteen traditions, and the likelihood is a bit of

¹⁰⁵ Frame-story, c.f. FM 279 (after Khaybar) and MA 28/199 (after Ḥunayn); FM 292 and MA 28/563 (ʿUqba's *khuṭba* context absent in FM); FM 278 and MA 39/361 (fasting context initially absent in FM). Synonyms, c.f. FM 288 and MA 28/525, 585 (*nazaʿahu nazʿan ʿanīqan* for *nazaʿahu nazʿan shadīdan ka-l-kāriḥ*); FM 292 and MA 28/563 (*muʾmin* for *imriʾ*); FM 266-7 and MA 44/343 (*yujāmiʿuhā* for *yanāmu/yudājiʿuhā*); FM 97, 282 and MA 45/201 (FM gives location for prayer). Gloss, c.f. FM 288 and MA 28/525 (MA glosses *farrūj*); FM 97, 282 and MA 45/201 (MA glosses *shāhid* as *najm*). Concision, c.f. FM 303 and MA 29/569 (FM version switches into third person to avoid direct speech and repetition); FM 306 and MA 39/438 (FM version in third rather than first person, details absent, MA version fuller and includes meta-juristic conclusion of Muḥammad publicly displaying his action as legal precedent); FM 104, 259-60 and MA 39/442 (slight compression in FM).

both. However, given the observable trend of minor abbreviation by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam in some of the material from Ibn Hishām’s recension of Ibn Ishāq, which is undeniably his choice, the fact that such variant independent reports as I have investigated indicate that the brevity of the version in FM is unique to that text, and the fact that in some cases the concision of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *matns* appears to obscure the legal point in question, it seems likely that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was abbreviating the reports.¹⁰⁶

In terms of the transmission history described in our extant witnesses to these reports, all of Aḥmad’s *isnāds* go back to < Ibn Ishāq – Yazīd > . This is because this was the criterion by

¹⁰⁶ An example of unique brevity in FM is FM 282 where we find Muḥammad telling his followers, ‘Tomorrow we ride, God willing, to Jews (*ilā yahūd*). When they greet you, reply to them.’ Various versions of this *ḥadīth* can be found in Aḥmad’s *Musnad*. The common *isnād*-link in these, as well as with FM, is Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb. Two are then derived from Ibn Ishāq (MA 28/527 and probably 29/581, which misses out Ibn Ishāq, but the Yazīd (b. Hārūn) who is Aḥmad’s informant for this *ḥadīth* is too young to have directly met Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, see TI 5/228, and generally relates to Yazīd via Ibn Ishāq, see MA 2/146, 27/281, 28/585-6, 29/579 etc.), one from a Medinan and one from an Egyptian scholar (MA 45/210-11). In all of these versions Muḥammad gives the imperative ‘Do not initiate the greeting with them’ (*lā tabda’ūhum bi-l-salām*) before saying that it is permissible to return their greeting. The consistency of this inclusion between different lines of transmission except for FM suggests that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam omitted or cut this fairly important guide to the significance of the *ḥadīth*.

Another case where the FM version of a *ḥadīth* seems to obscure the legal point is a story regarding Muḥammad’s encounter with two men of Madhḥij. In Aḥmad’s version of the story (MA 28/611), transmitted from Yazīd by Ibn Ishāq, the first Madhḥijī asks Muḥammad what will become of a follower of Muḥammad who has met him and the second regarding a follower who hasn’t met him. Muḥammad emphasises the salvation of his non-personal followers. In FM’s version of this (FM 295), the second Madhḥijī does not ask a different question, neutering what seems to be the main point of the *ḥadīth*. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s transmission of this goes through Ibn Ishāq, which indicates that this loss of meaning is not due to Egyptian transmission: either Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had a defective non-Egyptian transmission of this, or he himself curtailed it so drastically. The implications of the second position will be considered later in the thesis when I discuss the role of legal material and discourse within FM, arguing that FM is not a legal handbook, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did not think it necessary to include independently comprehensible versions of legal *ḥadīth*, and thus their inclusion is intended to further particular arguments rather than function as law, my main criticism of Brunschvig’s otherwise excellent article on FM. See, Brunschvig, ‘Ibn Abdelḥakam’.

which I selected these reports. Twelve of the fourteen corresponding narrations in FM have Yazīd as their common link with Aḥmad's *isnād*, showing that the Egyptian tradition mostly remembered Yazīd as the teacher of these narratives, just as Aḥmad did in Iraq. Neither Aḥmad nor Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam consistently use the same *isnād* for these common reports, suggesting that they were not transmitted as a package or proto-book either from Yazīd or from Ibn Ishāq (unlike his *Sīra*). It seems unlikely that Aḥmad, one of the master-*isnād*-critics of early Islam, himself forged *isnāds* to make it seem as if a collected body of reports attributed to Yazīd were in fact scattered among Iraqi transmitters. Conversely, the idea that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, who never left Egypt as far as we know, hunted down the scattered reports from Yazīd known to various Iraqi transmitters and then invented a series of different Egyptain-only *isnāds* for them, seems implausible, especially given the sustained, minor textual divergences between the corresponding reports. Thus, the variation in the *isnāds* to both Aḥmad and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam together makes it seem less likely that the presence of these parallel *ḥadīths* in FM and Aḥmad's *Musnad* is due to either's unacknowledged reliance on a common later source, rather than the transmission processes both describe.

The two cases in which Aḥmad and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's *isnāds* for parallel reports have a common link who is not Yazīd further support the notion that these *isnāds* accurately describe knowledge-transmission in the first half of the second/eighth century. In these cases, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam does not transmit through Yazīd but rather through the scholars Aḥmad lists as Yazīd's informants: Rabīʿa b. Sulaym Abū Marzūq (d. unknown, but an older

contemporary of Yazīd)¹⁰⁷, Khayr b. Nu‘aym (d. 136/754-5)¹⁰⁸, or Ibn Hubayra (d. 126/743-4)¹⁰⁹. The crucial fact is that these common links are either contemporaries of or slightly younger than Yazīd. Egyptian scholars would have used *isnāds* connecting to Rabī‘a, Khayr, and Ibn Hubayra not through their contemporary Yazīd, but through the younger generation of students who studied under them, because of the principle that a shorter *isnād* was a better *isnād*. So why didn’t Ibn Ishāq relate these reports directly from them rather than through Yazīd, given that they were alive when he was in Egypt? The solution is surely because he visited Egypt for a limited time, or was only in a limited geographical area (it is noted that he visited Alexandria, not the capital, Fustāt), and was not able to meet them. Therefore, when he studied with Yazīd, he learned (and subsequently transmitted) some reports which Yazīd knew from his colleagues rather than his own teachers, because Ibn Ishāq was not going to be able to meet those colleagues on his sojourn.¹¹⁰ Therefore these exceptions plausibly reflect the different exigencies under which Ibn Ishāq and native Egyptian scholars would have transmitted these reports.

In conclusion, inspecting Ibn Ishāq’s transmissions from Yazīd in Aḥmad’s *Musnad* in comparison with *ḥadīth* found in FM reveals a significant body of common material. The close

¹⁰⁷ FM 279, MA 28/199. Rabī‘a b. Sulaym is listed only as Abū Marzūq *mawlā* of Tujīb by Aḥmad, but see TKAR 9/112-3 for the name. Here, al-Mizzī also tells us that not only Yazīd related from him, but younger scholars such as Ibn Lahī‘a and Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb, who were themselves students of Yazīd. This means that he can’t have been much older than Yazīd.

¹⁰⁸ FM 97, 282, MA 45/201. Death date: TI 3/639.

¹⁰⁹ FM 97, 282, MA 45/201. Death date: TI 3/448, TKAR 16/242-4.

¹¹⁰ TKAR 24/406-10 affirms that despite having come to Egypt, Ibn Ishāq did not study with

correspondence between the parallel *ḥadīths* found in both suggests a common origin. Minor textual differences seem to indicate the alterations one might expect from a formal transmission process with a strong emphasis on preserving the key progression and active vocabulary of the anecdote, but which was somewhat relaxed about the use of synonyms and paraphrase when framing the anecdote. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is the likely cause of the abbreviated form of many of the *ḥadīths* in FM, some of which are so abbreviated as to obscure the legal point for which they were used. In six cases, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam transmits these *ḥadīths* from non-Egyptian authorities, connecting himself to Yazīd via Ibn Ishāq. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s acceptance of these occasions when he was reliant on Iraqi transmission for originally Egyptian material makes it unlikely that he was inventing Egyptian transmission histories when he does give them. In the majority (12/14) of cases when he is not indirectly reliant on Ibn Ishāq, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *isnād* also goes back to Yazīd and thenceforth reports the same transmission as Aḥmad’s *isnād*.¹¹¹ I argue that the likeliest common source for these parallel texts is what the *isnāds* claim: Yazīd’s teaching. This would have been delivered to Ibn Ishāq when he was in Alexandria in 115/733-4 and to Yazīd’s Egyptian students in the period before his death in 128/745-6. If we accept that these texts are independent witnesses to that source, then we accept that FM contains genuine information very close to what was circulated in the first half of the second/eighth century.

¹¹¹ This suggests that Yazīd had himself related these *ḥadīths* with full lines of transmission to companions.

Both Aḥmad and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam report various lines of transmission back to Yazīd for these reports, suggesting that Yazīd transmitted his legal teachings in an atomised rather than packaged form. The two occasions when Yazīd is not the common link between Aḥmad and FM’s common reports can be explained by Ibn Ishāq’s limited access to Egyptian teachers. Thus, he learned *ḥadīth* which Yazīd transmitted from his contemporaries (i.e. a generationally horizontal *isnād*-link), which Egyptian scholars would have transmitted from those scholars’ students (a generationally vertical *isnād*-link). This explicable deviation from the norm supports the notion that the *isnāds* for these reports are a real representation of their transmission history back to the time of Yazīd, and that the biographical traditions which place Ibn Ishāq in Alexandria for a limited period are true. These different common links found in independent sources are not able to independently verify the content of Egyptian transmissions from before the generation of Yazīd. Thus, they support the notion that the stabilisation of content and transmission of *ḥadīth* and historical material should be dated to Yazīd’s era. This again, confirms what the biographical tradition says about Yazīd, being the first to institute proper study of the religious sciences, giving us confidence in the biographical tradition regarding scholars from Yazīd’s period onwards. Though it might be concluded that the biographical tradition was concocted to explain the evidence of the *isnāds*, and that they are not independent sources of information, my feeling after studying these sources in depth is, again, that the level of co-ordination required to make the biographical, textual, and *isnād*-evidence line up across unrelated texts from Egypt and Iraq makes the idea of fabrication implausible.

At this point, given my analysis of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s practice with regard to citing the *Sīra*, and the conclusions from checking *ḥadīths* in Aḥmad’s *Musnad* against FM, I am content to analyse the origins of the Egyptian historical tradition on the basis that FM’s *isnād*-data is probably an accurate reflection of the origin of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s information, at least down to the generation of Yazīd. As we will see in the next chapter and chapter eight, the *isnāds* supplied for the key narrative sources which inform FM claim that they were compiled in the late Umayyad period. Given what we have observed in this chapter, this is a claim I am willing to take seriously.

Chapter Six:

Three conquests of Babylon: Identifying ‘backbone’ accounts in *Futūḥ Miṣr*

In Chapter Four we closely examined how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam excerpted short passages from a large-scale packaged text, Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra*, and incorporated them into his own narrative structure. However, this was not the primary way in which he assembled his text. FM is not a work of total collage, entirely pieced together from isolated reports extracted from other texts or *ḥadīth*-collections. Rather, as we shall see, the narrative sections of FM are all based on pre-existing accounts which were themselves coherent historical narratives, not *akhbār* relating individual, decontextualized incidents. I call these pre-existing narratives his ‘backbone accounts’, because each makes up the spine running through a section of his text, onto which other reports are grafted.¹¹² Once these backbone accounts are identified, we see that much of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam compositional activity consisted of interjecting relevant reports from other sources into their text, breaking them up almost like an interlinear commentary. Aside from these interlinear interjections, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam also supplemented the backbone accounts by adding introductory and concluding sections. These deviations from the main accounts which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had to hand – when he supplies extra information, alternative perspectives, or editorialising commentary – are the best means we have of pinpointing his own authorial activity and agenda. Part III of this

¹¹² I have not consciously borrowed this term from other scholarship, and use it the sense outlined in the pages below. I continue to use the term ‘package’ as defined in the Introduction, see above, pp. 19-20.

dissertation will explore the nature and origins of these pre-existing narratives, and how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used and recast them. Firstly, however, it is necessary to show how Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam signalled in his text that he was using them.

Three perspectives on the conquest of Babylon

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam explicitly states that he is using three different sources which give conflicting accounts of the siege of the Roman fortress of Babylon. Babylon is presented in FM as the crux of the Egyptian campaign, where the overall terms of Egypt's capitulation are agreed. The conquest of Alexandria may be the chronological climax of the campaign, but it is represented as a drive against only the 'Romans' and the legal consequences of its forceful conflict are limited to the city.¹¹³ Babylon is where the 'Copts' submit to the Muslims, and where the terms which govern the relationship between the Muslims and the Egyptians are agreed. The province-wide applicability of the terms reached at the conquest of Babylon, according to these accounts, probably reflects the historical fact that peace-terms were actually made between Cyrus and ʿAmr at Babylon, though not at the time of the conquest of the fortress as FM has it.¹¹⁴ Moreover, as Babylon would become the site of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, the capital of early Islamic Egypt, its conquest provides a narratively satisfying moment for the translation of authority in Egypt from Rome to the caliphate.¹¹⁵ These significances explain

¹¹³ For traditions that Alexandria alone was considered *ʿanwatan*, see FM 82-3, 83, 84, 87-8. This idea is also present in al-Balādhurī's traditions.

¹¹⁴ John of Nikiu, *Chronicle*, ch. cxx, places the conclusion of terms at Babylon.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. ch. cxvii, does not mention any special terms made at the time of the actual conquest of Babylon.

why Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam highlights the discrepancies between his accounts of the conquest of the fortress. Fortunately for us, by doing so he exposes his own perception of the form of his text as he put it together.

He clearly distinguishes between three different narratives of the conquest of the fortress, which he presents more or less one after the other. Exactly how he fits these together will be explored in chapters eight and nine. The first version of the conquest which he gives concludes with the surrender of the fortress, at which a one-off payment of gold and clothing is given and the imposition of a regular tribute of 20,000 dinars agreed.¹¹⁶ Notably, this account does not present the terms agreed at Babylon as applicable Egypt-wide, rather as a local agreement.¹¹⁷ After a few reports on the aftermath of the conquest we encounter the line:

He said: I have heard another point of view (*wajh*) than this regarding the conquest of the fortress.¹¹⁸

The speaker of this sentence must be Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and, as good as his word, he then narrates an alternative account. This one culminates not with the fortress opened to the Muslims by its occupants, but rather with its walls scaled and gates opened by al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām. Fearing for his life, al-Muqawqis, the Roman leader, makes a peace-agreement

¹¹⁶ FM 59-60.

¹¹⁷ Unless the 20,000 dinars is supposed to be a daily payment, which would produce an annual figure (c. 7,300,000 dinars) of a roughly similar magnitude to discussions of Egypt's total annual liability elsewhere, e.g. FM 70, 12,000,000 or 16,000,000 dinars; FM 86, 1,600,000; FM 161, 12,000,000..

¹¹⁸ FM 60, ll. 21-2. *qāla wa-qad samiʿtu fī fatḥi -l-qaṣri wajhan ghayra dhālika.*

(*ṣulḥ*) on the basis that each Copt will pay the Arabs two dinars annually.¹¹⁹ Once this is wrapped up, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam interjects again:

He said: I have heard another point of view (*wajh*) regarding the conquest of the fortress which entirely contradicts the two [preceding] accounts. God knows best.¹²⁰

Then he relates a different series of events which also conclude with the violent conquest of Babylon. However, negotiations are then conducted with al-Muqawqis and other leaders of the Copts and Romans who had vacated the fortress and fortified themselves on the island in the Nile. The result is the same: the imposition of a *jizya* of two dinars on each adult Copt.¹²¹

Thus, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam demarcates three points of view or perspectives (*wajhs*) on the conquest of Babylon. These are not standalone reports, however. Each of these three *wajhs* is related as part of one of three larger, discrete sets of events, repeatedly relayed on the authority of the same *isnād*. If we combine the texts verified by each different set of repeated *isnāds*, ignoring the interjections which break them up, each provides a joined-up sequence of events adding up to a complete conquest-narrative. This strongly suggests that these were three continuous prose narratives of the conquest which predated FM. Therefore, even when content from one of these accounts appears in FM as a short *khbar* on a particular event, this is because Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam has broken up the account to fit it into his formal scheme of *isnād* and *khbar*. It does not reflect the original form of this information.

¹¹⁹ FM 63-4.

¹²⁰ FM 64, ll. 9-10. *qāla wa-qad samiʿtu fī fatḥi -l-qaṣri wajhan ākhara mukhālīfan li-l-ḥadīthayni jamīʿan.*

¹²¹ FM 69-72.

Establishing the *riwāya-isnād*

Examining these three *wajhs* allows us to identify two features which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam uses to communicate that a given *isnād* in his work is not just there to authorise a particular report, but is in fact a *riwāya-isnād* which indicates his use of an extended pre-existing account as backbone of a particular section. The most diagnostic of these is when he tells us that he is returning to the ‘*ḥadīth* of so-and-so’, giving an abbreviated form of an *isnād* which he has already provided in full. These instances of returning to the *ḥadīth* of x are not, therefore, examples of indistinct citation-practice, which we would not expect from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam given what we saw in chapter four. Rather they refer to an original *riwāya-isnād*. The second diagnostic feature is when he indicates that a particular person in one of his *isnāds* – usually in the second-to-earliest layer – amalgamated information transmitted to them by several different teachers, using the phrase ‘some of whom added more than others’ (*yazīdu ba‘ḍuhum ‘alā ba‘ḍ*). I propose that this amalgamation marks the creation of the unified account, which was subsequently passed on wholesale through the later layers of the *isnād*.

At this point it may be worth clarifying my term *riwāya-isnād*. A *riwāya* is the list of individuals which a given scholar would use to describe the chain of teacher-student relationships which connected them to the author of a book which they claimed to know and have the authority to teach. It has the same form as an *isnād* and is effectively the same thing, except the thing being transmitted is not a single report but a book. The book in turn may contain many *isnāds*.

The *riwāya* connects the person claiming to know the book, through its author, to those *isnāds*.

My argument is that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam constructed his text around various pre-existing extended narrative accounts. These accounts formed the backbone of different sections of his work, with Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam interjecting other reports to supplement and comment on them. At the beginning of a section of his work which was reliant on a particular package, he would provide his *riwāya* to that package. This is what I will term the *riwāya-isnād*, as it shares characteristics of both an *isnād* (being the manner in which our author connects himself to the sources from which he made up a text of his own selection and organisation) and a *riwāya* (being a connection to a package of information which another actor had selected and organised). Jens Scheiner has recently proven that various repeatedly-used *isnāds* in *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq* are in fact such internal *riwāyas*, which Ibn ʿAsākir used to indicate his use of particular pre-existing books. I argue that the repeatedly-used *isnāds* in FM indicate a similar practice of excerpting from pre-existing packages of historical information. The way Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam indicated this can be shown through a closer look at *isnāds* Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used to signpost his use of the three packages of information related to the three different *wajhs* on the conquest of Babylon.

1. The *ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb

The first account of the conquest which we looked at above, in which the fortress is surrendered without fighting, is prefaced by the statement, ‘Ibn Wahb said in his account

(*ḥadīthi*) from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Shurayḥ . . .’¹²² This, however, clearly refers back to an *isnād* provided earlier on the page:

‘Then he returned to the account of Ibn Wahb from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Shurayḥ from Sharāḥīl b. Yazīd from Abū al-Ḥusayn, that he heard a man from Lakhm say . . .’¹²³

As it suggests by the use of the term, ‘he returned . . .’, this *isnād* is itself referring back to an earlier instance of the *isnād*, which is provided at the beginning of the page.¹²⁴ That instance is the first time that the *isnād* is given, and in that first instantiation the intermediary link between Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871) and Ibn Wahb (d. 197/813) is also given, thus giving us a full chain of transmission purportedly linking Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to an eyewitness of the events.¹²⁵ This is the *riwāya-isnād*, to which the subsequent references refer back. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam uses this package one final time, by which point he simply introduces it by saying, ‘Ibn Wahb said in his *ḥadīth* . . .’

The texts attached to these *isnāds* clearly follow on from one another consecutively. The account takes us in brief from the arrival of ‘Amr’s army at al-Qawāṣir – somewhere in the Delta between al-Faramā/Pelusium and Babylon – to the aftermath of the siege of Babylon, including a battle fought on the outskirts of Babylon.¹²⁶ These texts clearly cross-reference

¹²² FM 59, l. 23 to 60, l. 1.

¹²³ FM 59, ll. 14-15.

¹²⁴ FM 59, ll. 2-4.

¹²⁵ ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama, d. 224/838-9.

¹²⁶ Though al-Qawāṣir’s location is seemingly known only from FM: Yāqūt’s entry on it, MB 4/411, appears to be a logical deduction from ‘Amr’s route as described in FM.

one another. For example, a prophetic prediction made by a Copt in the first text attached to this *isnād* is reiterated in the final text associated with it, and a banquet proposed in the third citation of the account is a point of discussion in the fourth.¹²⁷ This was originally a continuous account authorised by a single line of transmission. However, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was content to abbreviate this *isnād* when he thought that his audience would understand, through his introduction of the idea of ‘returning’ to a particular *ḥadīth*, that he was reusing an *isnād* which he had mentioned earlier in full. Therefore, the initially full provision of the *isnād* is gradually abridged as it is re-invoked, until it can be signalled by simply referring to it as the *ḥadīth* of one particular individual in the *isnād*, here ‘the *ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb’.

2. The first *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān: Ibn Lahī‘a’s account

The same pattern obtains for the second *wajh* on the conquest of the fortress, the one which has al-Zubayr scale the walls with a ladder. This event is introduced with the statement, ‘‘Uthmān said in his *ḥadīth* . . .’¹²⁸ Close attention to the *isnāds* reveals that again this refers back to a *riwāya-isnād* that is given in full earlier in the text. On page fifty-five, line twenty-two, we are told:

‘Uthmān related to us [i.e. to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam]: ‘Ibn Lahī‘a related to us [i.e. ‘Uthmān] from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ja‘far and ‘Ayyāsh b. ‘Abbās al-Qitbānī and others, some of whom added more than others.

¹²⁷ Compare FM 59 ll. 7-8 with p. 60, ll. 9-10 for the prophecy; FM 60, ll. 4-6 for the banquet.

¹²⁸ FM 63, l. 9.

After this Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam repeatedly tells us that he is ‘returning’ to the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān or simply stating that ‘Uthmān said in his *ḥadīth*’, with the full identical *isnād* being given again on one occasion.¹²⁹ These scattered reports display formal correspondences, and when stitched together produce a coherent narrative of the entire campaign from ‘Amr’s departure from Syria to his conquest of the fortress of Babylon, which would originally have been uninterrupted. Thus, each reference in this section to the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ is shorthand for the *isnād* given originally, which can be read as the *riwāya* of the account.

3. The second *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān: the account of Ibn Ayyūb and Ibn Ḥumayd

The final version of the conquest of Babylon, which has the fortress conquered forcefully but al-Muqawqis negotiating from the island, is related in a long report almost two pages long. This begins with the statement, ‘Then he returned to the *ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd . . .’¹³⁰ The *riwāya* of this *ḥadīth* starts on page sixty-four, line eleven, where we read:

‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ related to us: Khālīd b. Najīḥ reported to us [i.e. ‘Uthmān] from Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd who said: Khālīd b. Yazīd related to us from a group of the ‘successors’,¹³¹ some of whom added more than others.

¹²⁹ FM 56, l. 10; p. 58, l. 17; p. 59, ll. 1, 10; p. 62, l. 4; p. 63, ll. 9, 13. The repetition of the full *isnād* begins at FM 60, l. 22. The reason for this is that on pp. 59-60 he has been referring to the *ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb, and thus wants to clarify in full that he has returned to ‘Uthmān’s backbone account.

¹³⁰ FM 70, l. 21. The *ḥabār* ends at p. 72, l. 11.

¹³¹ ‘Successors’ are the *tābi‘ūn*, Muslims too young to have met Muḥammad but who had directly encountered those who had. See EI2, ‘Tābi‘ūn’.

This *riwāya* tells us that like the previous ‘*wajh*’, this account was taught to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ. However, ‘Uthmān had learned this narrative not from Ibn Lahī‘a but another of his teachers, Khālīd b. Najīḥ. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduces this *riwāya* immediately following his statement that he has heard a point of view which ‘entirely contradicts’ the first *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān (*mukhālīfan lahu jamī‘an*). Thus, he clearly demarcates the accounts attached to the two different *riwāya-isnāds*. This shows that he conceived of these as two separate accounts, even though they were both taught to him by ‘Uthmān.

Having introduced the *riwāya* to the second *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam indicates that he ‘returns’ to this account some thirteen times, calling it ‘the *ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd’ and ‘the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ interchangeably.¹³² We have seen that in pp. 55-63 ‘the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ referred to the *isnād* of the *riwāya* on page fifty-five, tracing that account back through Ibn Lahī‘a to Ibn Abī Ja‘far and al-Qitbānī. This is what I have dubbed ‘the first *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’. However, a close reading of the texts between pp. 64-87 which are attributed to the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ and the ‘*ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd’ reveals that they are excerpts of one originally unbroken text. Not only do the reports combine into a coherent narrative of the campaign from the siege of Babylon to the conquest of Alexandria, but they are so textually seamless that pronouns in one report refer back to referents in the other. For example, the end of one extract from the ‘*ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd’ reads:

¹³² FM 65, l. 1; p. 66, l. 2; p. 70, l. 21; p. 73, l. 3; 73, l. 19; p. 74, l. 13; p. 76, ll. 3, 14; p. 77, l. 11; p. 79, l. 14; p. 80, l. 2; p. 83, l. 13; p. 87, l. 20.

Al-Muqawqis sent his envoys back to the Muslims with the message, ‘Send us your envoys so that we may deal with them and agree together on what will be of benefit to both us and you.’ ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ sent ten men, one of whom was ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit.¹³³

After Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam interjects a brief report on the topic of ‘Ubāda’s height, we read:

Then he returned to the account of ‘Uthmān, who said: ‘Amr ordered him [i.e. ‘Ubāda] to be the spokesman of the army and not to accept anything but . . .¹³⁴

The pronominal object of the opening verb in the second report is not clarified: it is not a standalone report. Rather, it is a direct continuation from the last sentence from the ‘*ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd’, for which ‘the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ is clearly here a synonym. Equally continuous transitions between reports attributed with the two different names can be found throughout.¹³⁵ Many of these individual reports are long, substantial narratives in themselves. One is over four pages long, further demonstrating that the original form of this account was that of a long, continuous narration rather than broken-up *isnāds* and *khbars*.¹³⁶ Thus, each of the three points of view (*wajhs*) on the conquest of Babylon which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam demarcated can be shown to be extracts from pre-existing,

¹³³ FM 65, l. 23 – p. 66, l. 1.

¹³⁴ FM 66, ll. 2-3.

¹³⁵ For example, the transition between FM 70, l. 13, and p. 70, l. 21. Here, the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ which begins at FM 66, l.2 ends at p. 70, l.13, where it discusses the terms imposed on the Copts. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam then introduces two reports from different sources on lines 14-20. He then says he is ‘returning’ to the ‘*ḥadīth* of Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd’, which discusses the terms imposed on the Romans using the same terminology (*wa-sharaṭa -l-Muqawqis l-l-Rūm an . . .*, ll. 21-2) as was used in the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ several lines above (*fa-shuriṭa hādihā kulluhu ‘alā -l-Qibṭ*, ll. 9-10). It is a clear textual continuation of the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’. Furthermore, we again see a demonstrative pronoun referring back from one report to the preceding report (*an yuqīma ‘alā mithli dhālika*, l. 22, stating that the ‘Romans’ could stay in Egypt in accordance with the terms agreed for the Copts in the preceding report).

¹³⁶ FM 66, l.2 to p. 70, l.13.

extended accounts about the Egyptian campaign, which are clearly signalled through the notion of ‘returning’ to particular accounts.

Collective *isnāds* at the end of the *riwāya*

The above case demonstrates that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam expected his reader/auditor to understand the switch between the section of his text when ‘the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ referred to the *isnād* leading back to Ibn Abī Ja‘far and al-Qitbānī and when it referred to the account from Ibn Ayyūb and Ibn Ḥumayd. The reader had to understand that the *isnād* given on page sixty-four was a new *riwāya*, which would thenceforth be the referent for the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam helps his reader do this by stating explicitly that he is returning specifically to the ‘account of Ibn Ayyūb and Ibn Ḥumayd’ on the first occasion that he returns to that account after the *riwāya*, and only then starting to use the more ambiguous shorthand of the ‘account of ‘Uthmān’.

However, there is also another common feature of the *riwāya-isnāds*, which may have given his audience to expect that they introduced new continuous accounts which would be the basis of the following narrative. This is the use of the phrase *yazīdu ba‘ḍuhum ‘alā ba‘ḍin*, ‘some of whom added more than others’ at the end of the *riwāya-isnād*. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam concludes the *riwāya-isnād* for the ‘first *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ with this phrase when he gives it for the first time, and again when he restates after interrupting that account with the ‘*ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb’. He uses it again at the end of the *riwāya-isnād* for the ‘second *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ when

he gives that for the first time.¹³⁷ We will see that he also uses it when he gives the full *isnād* for his backbone account of pre-Islamic history, and for his backbone account of the western conquests.¹³⁸ Thus, it is used to introduce the *riwāya* for all of the major pre-existing accounts which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used as the basis for his pre-Islamic history and conquest history.¹³⁹

What exactly does the phrase mean? I argue that it indicates the use of a ‘collective *isnād*’ by that person in the second-to-earliest layer of the *riwāya-isnād*, indicating that they had synthesised an account from the multiple persons named in the earliest layer of the *isnād*. Collective *isnāds* came to be frowned upon by proper *ḥadīth* scholars, but they were used by historians, most infamously the great early *maghāzī*-experts Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, al-Wāqidī uses a similar phrase to *yazīdu ba‘duhum ‘alā ba‘d* at the end of the vast collective *isnād* with which he begins *al-Maghāzī*. There, al-Wāqidī names a large number of individuals and states that, ‘each of them related to me a portion of this, some of them being more detailed in their accounts’ (*kullun qad ḥaddathanī min hādhā bi-ṭā’ifatin wa-ba‘duhum aw‘ā li-ḥadīthihi min ba‘ḍin*).¹⁴¹ Thereafter, whenever al-Wāqidī writes *qālū*, his narrative is

¹³⁷ FM 55, l. 22; p. 60, l. 23; p. 64, l. 11.

¹³⁸ FM 8, l. 21; 128, l. 24. To be discussed in chs. 7 and 8 respectively.

¹³⁹ It should also be noted that in every one of these cases these accounts are transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, a point which will form the basis of the discussion of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s macro-arrangement, in chs. 8 and 9.

¹⁴⁰ On the collective *isnād* see also Chase Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, p. 97; Michael Lecker, ‘Wāqidī’s account on the status of the Jews in Medina: a study of a combined report’, *JNES* 54 (1995), pp. 15–32; Tarif Khalidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, p. 48.

¹⁴¹ Al-Wāqidī’s introduction, at the beginning of his *Maghāzī*, of the informants referred to when he states *qālū* is explained by J. M. B. Jones, ‘The *Maghāzī* Literature’ in A. F. L. Beeston et al (eds.) *Arabic literature to the end of the Umayyad period* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 348. I use Jones’ translation for al-Wāqidī’s methodological statement.

understood as being underpinned by the various accounts which al-Wāqidī had learned from these teachers but synthesised into his own continuous prose. Only very particular or contentious information is subsequently furnished by al-Wāqidī with a proper *isnād*. I would argue that FM's backbone accounts were similar in nature, beginning with a collective invocation of the teachers whose information the redactor was amalgamating, and proceeding thereafter as continuous prose, with only the occasional *isnād* thrown in.

Thus, in the *riwāya* for the 'first *ḥadīth* of 'Uthmān', the *isnād* concludes with Ibn Lahī'a relating from "Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ja'far, 'Ayyāsh b. 'Abbās al-Qitbānī and others (*ghayrihimā*)'. Here the formula claims that it was Ibn Lahī'a who amalgamated the details he learned from these teachers into a single narrative which he then transmitted to the scholars in the later part of the *isnād*. If we accept the *isnād* as a genuine reflection of the transmission history of this account, that would date the content of this account to the 130s/750s at the latest (when Ibn Lahī'a's informants died) and the form of its amalgamation to before 174/790-1 (when he died).¹⁴² In the 'second *ḥadīth* of 'Uthmān', the *riwāya* concludes with Khālīd b. Yazīd relating from 'a group of the successors (*jamā'atin mina -l-tābi'ina*)', arguing that Khālīd did the amalgamation. This would have had to take place before his death in 139/756, from material he had gathered earlier.¹⁴³ This would make the narrative accounts which underpinned FM late-Umayyad in content and early-'Abbāsīd in form.

¹⁴² Ibn Abī Ja'far died in 135/752-3 and al-Qitbānī in 133/750-1, see TI 3/690-1, 719. Ibn Lahī'a died in 174/790-1, see TI 4/668-72.

¹⁴³ TI 3/637-8

Of course, this is only the *isnāds*' claim. We lack other works with parallel transmissions of these accounts with which to prove earlier common links which would verify the *isnād* and the form of the account to a greater or lesser extent.¹⁴⁴ Al-Ṭabarī's account of the conquest of Egypt is almost entirely based on non-Egyptian sources and does not help us. Al-Balādhurī's material on Egypt in *Futūḥ al-buldān* is, by contrast, largely based on Egyptian sources. However, while it contains many parallel reports to those found in FM – the common links clustering in figures in Ibn Lahī'a's generation (d. c. 170s/790s) – none of them come from these backbone narrative packages.¹⁴⁵ This may be because these extended accounts were not generically suitable for *Futūḥ al-buldān*'s account of Egypt.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, there is no way to conclusively verify that these single-chain *isnāds* were not a 'dive': that is, that an earlier section of the *isnād* was invented by one of the later figures in it.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ i.e. there is no possibility for *isnād-cum-matn* analysis.

¹⁴⁵ For the parallel reports in FM and FB and their common links, see: FB 211, FM 56, 61 (Ibn Lahī'a, or Abū al-Aswad); FB 211, FM 88, l. 4 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 211, FM 88, l. 10 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 213, FM 72, 83 (al-Layth b. Sa'd); FB 213, FM 161 (same report, no common link); FB 214, FM 89 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 215, FM 90 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 215, FM 86 (Yahyā b. Ayyūb); FB 215-6, FM 88 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 216, FM 72 ('Abd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ); FB 217, FM 88 (Ibn Lahī'a); FB 217, FM 88 (Ibn Wahb); FB 219-20, FM 130 ('Abd al-Malik b. Maslama); FB 221, FM 175, 177, 178 (part Ibn Lahī'a, part Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb). I have presented a paper and will publish an article on what a comparison of FB and FM shows us about how al-Balādhurī got his information on and represented the conquest of Egypt, and contrasting the background of those scholars who argued in favour of Egyptian conquest by force and by treaty.

¹⁴⁶ On al-Balādhurī, see R. Lynch, 'Between the conquests and the court : a critical analysis of the Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān of al-Balādhurī' (University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2016).

¹⁴⁷ On 'diving', G. Juynboll, '(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in ḥadīth science', *Islamic Law and Society* 8 (2001), pp. 303-49.

At the very least, however, ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ’s transmission of two conflicting accounts on the conquest suggests that he did not invent them both. Therefore, the *isnāds* attached to these accounts demonstrate the transmission of two packaged accounts of Egypt’s conquest at least as far back as the lifetime of ‘Uthmān’s direct informants for these accounts (pre-174/790-1 for that taught to him by Ibn Lahī’a, pre-204/819-2 for that taught by Khālīd).¹⁴⁸ Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s own largely scrupulous citation practice has been established through his use of Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra*. Further, we have seen FM successfully preserving, on the authority of the Egyptian scholarly tradition, the main content of *ḥadīth* which circulated in Egypt as early as 115/733-4. Thus, there is no *prima facie* reason to rule out the possibility that the contents of these two accounts derive, as they claim, from their earliest named transmitters in the late Umayyad period.

‘Returning to the *ḥadīth*’: a technical term?

The consistency of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s usage when indicating these *riwāya-isnāds* raises the question of whether he was deploying a more widely used, even technical terminology. We do find superficially comparable usages in Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra*, to which we have seen Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had access. For example, an account of Muḥammad’s night-journey is introduced as the ‘*ḥadīth* of al-Ḥasan’. It is then interrupted by an alternative account and resumed with the heading: ‘A return to the *ḥadīth* of al-Ḥasan’ (‘*awdun ilā ḥadīthi -l-Ḥasan*).¹⁴⁹ The same occurs with a *ḥadīth* of al-Khudrī about Muḥammad’s ascension, including exactly parallel

¹⁴⁸ On the basis of the death dates of Ibn Lahī’a (TD 32/159) and Khālīd b. Najīḥ (TI 5/66-7).

¹⁴⁹ IH 1/397-8.

terminology to that in FM: *thumma rajaʿa ilā ḥadīthi Abī Saʿīd al-Khudrī*.¹⁵⁰ But these are instances of longer reports about a single event being interrupted and resumed, rather than the extended accounts incorporating different events which we see in FM, and these are a marginal rather than structuring feature of those works. Likewise, in Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ's *History* we find one section in which Khalīfa presents two accounts with full *isnāds* in parallel, switching back and forth between the two using the phrase *thumma rajaʿa ilā ḥadīthi fulān*.¹⁵¹ In al-Fasawī's *Knowledge and History* (*al-Maʿrifa wa-l-taʾrīkh*) we also find an instance where he uses the phrase *ʿāda -l-ḥadīthu ilā ḥadīthi -l-Zuhrī*.¹⁵² However, these isolated usages are again marginal uses of the same vocabulary. They indicate the continuation of single interrupted reports rather than *riwāyas* to a backbone account.

In contrast, al-Ṭabarī, the greatest of *isnād-khabar* historians, did use very similar terminology to present extracts from apparently extended pre-existing works which he repeatedly used. Whereas in FM we read 'then [Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam] returned to the account of so-and-so' (*thumma rajaʿa ilā ḥadīthi fulān*), in al-Ṭabarī's *History* we find the phrase 'then the account returned to the account of so-and-so' (*thumma rajaʿa -l-ḥadīthu ilā ḥadīthi fulān*). Just as in FM we see an initially full *isnād* to the package being abbreviated with reuse. Once it has been repeatedly mentioned, al-Ṭabarī simply states that the account is returning to 'the *ḥadīth*' of a particular link in the *isnād*.

¹⁵⁰ IH 1/403, 405.

¹⁵¹ TKh 1/147-9.

¹⁵² MT 3/301-2.

Let us take the example of the ‘account of al-Suddī’ as an example.¹⁵³ Al-Ṭabarī gives an *isnād* including the transmitter al-Suddī on page thirty-nine of the first volume of his history. It is then repeated exactly and in full multiple times, with slightly abbreviated forms of the names.¹⁵⁴ As the text progresses, the earlier stages of the *isnād* beyond al-Suddī are replaced with, ‘the *isnād* which we have already mentioned’.¹⁵⁵ After a section of the text in which al-Suddī’s information is accessed through alternative *isnāds*, none of which are glossed as ‘previously mentioned’, the original *isnād* is mentioned in full again.¹⁵⁶ From this point onwards we are told that ‘the account returned to the account of al-Suddī’ or given the partial *isnād* concluded with the phrase ‘from al-Suddī with the *isnād* we have already mentioned’. Occasional other *isnāds* involving al-Suddī are used, but again with no indication that they are part of a scheme of reuse.¹⁵⁷ Al-Ṭabarī’s dubbing this narrative ‘the account of al-Suddī’ of course does not necessarily mean that al-Suddī was the original compiler: without further work on this case it could be anyone mentioned in the *isnād*. However, the identity of the

¹⁵³ Al-Suddī (d. 127/744-5), on whom see TI 3/371-2.

¹⁵⁴ At TT 1/39 we find the *isnād*: < Mūsā b. Ḥārūn al-Hamdānī - ‘Amr b. Ḥammād - Asbāṭ b. Naṣr - al-Suddī in a report which he mentioned - Abū Mālik - Abū Ṣāliḥ - Ibn ‘Abbās > . Slightly abbreviated repetitions can be found at e.g. pp. 47, 52, 53-4, 55, 81, etc.

¹⁵⁵ TT 1/253, 306, 308, 312, etc. ‘*ani -l-Suddī bi-l-isnādi -lladhī qad dhakartuhu qablu*’.

¹⁵⁶ Alternative *isnāds* can be found at TT 1/332, 333, 334, 337, etc., until the original *isnād* is resumed at p. 388.

¹⁵⁷ He returns to the *ḥadīth* of al-Suddī at TT 1/396, 397, 398, 400, 403, 410, 421, etc. Different *isnāds* are occasionally invoked, e.g. p. 423, after which the main line of transmission is reasserted either by some variant of the phrase ‘[al-Suddī] mentioned in the report whose *isnād* I have previously mentioned’, e.g. pp. 428, 439, provision of the full *isnād*, e.g. pp. 432, 436, 458, and eventually resuming the phrase ‘the account returned to the account of al-Suddī’, e.g. pp. 469, 472.

isnād being used time and time again on different topics suggests that the account was both continuous and extended.

Al-Suddī's account is not the only one identifiable in al-Ṭabarī's *History* through this formula. We also find al-Ṭabarī returning to accounts which he ascribes to Ibn Ishāq,¹⁵⁸ Wahb b. Munabbih,¹⁵⁹ ʿUmar b. Shabba,¹⁶⁰ ʿAwāna,¹⁶¹ Sayf b. ʿUmar,¹⁶² and Abū Mikhnaḥ.¹⁶³ Thus, we can see that al-Ṭabarī's terminology when using pre-existing packages of information is both consistent and parallels that of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam. Al-Ṭabarī had travelled to Egypt during Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's lifetime and reproduces several reports on Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's authority in his *History*, though none of them from FM.¹⁶⁴ Though it would be a stretch to argue that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's methodology influenced al-Ṭabarī, we can at least say that both were operating in a tradition of *isnād-khabar* historians incorporating more extended accounts into their works, of which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam appears to be the earliest extant example.

¹⁵⁸ TT 1/203, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 247, etc.

¹⁵⁹ TT 1/324, referring to the *isnād* repeated at pp. 39, 43, 177, 201 etc.

¹⁶⁰ TT 7/577, 579, 590, 591, referring to the *isnād* at TT 3/240 and re-invoked with the phrase 'the *isnād* mentioned beforehand' – *bi-l-isnādi -lladhī qad taqaddama dhikruhu*, pp. 343, 385, 387. This *isnād* is also referred to as the *ḥadīth* of ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, who was Ibn Shabba's informant, see the above references and TT 3/406, 418, 419, 420, 422.

¹⁶¹ TT 4/565, referring to full *isnāds* at e.g. pp. 523, 561, 562.

¹⁶² TT 3/275, 339, 350, 437, 472, 4/43, 127, 148, 345, 466, 470, 502, 503, 512 etc.

¹⁶³ TT 5/47, 48, 53, 59, 105, 122, 126 etc., referring to the *isnād* given in full at pp. 5, 39, 42, 45.

¹⁶⁴ EI2, 'al-Ṭabarī' places him 'with some certainty' in Egypt in 253/867 and again more uncertainly in 256/870, both dates before Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's death. Al-Ṭabarī cites him as a direct informant twelve times in his *History*, at TT 1/113, 114, 365; 2/316, 389, 390, 391, 453; 3/168; 4/38, 197; 11/572.

Beyond Babylon: two further backbone accounts

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did not only employ pre-existing texts as the basis for his account of the conquest of Egypt. As will be illustrated in full in the next section of this dissertation, the other two narrative sections of FM – the pre-Islamic history and the history of the western conquests – were each built on a pre-existing backbone account.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, each of them was transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, just as were the two main accounts of the conquest of Egypt. These are indicated in exactly the same way as the backbone narratives of the conquest of Egypt: through the initial introduction of the *riwāya-isnād* concluded with the phrase *yazīdu ba‘ḍuhum ‘alā ba‘ḍ*; and the subsequent use of the phrase ‘then he returned to the account of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ’. These dispersed ‘returns’ introduce reports which, when read consecutively, form a seamless narrative. Thus, while FM takes the form of pure *isnād-khabar* history, all of its narrative sections are in fact built on extended narratives of continuous prose, which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam broke up by interjecting other reports and commentary.

¹⁶⁵ See below, pp. 210-13, 292-8.

Conclusions to Part II

The findings of the previous chapters are the foundations on which the analysis in Part III will be built. Chapter Four established that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam employed *isnāds* rigorously, closely following the texts of the works which he was citing, while noting his ability to recast the significance of these texts by placing them in new narrative contexts. Chapter Five showed that in the instances where I have been able to test the reality and accuracy of the transmission process his *isnāds* describe, we see that they indicate real preservation of content from the first half of the second/eighth century. Finally, the identification in Chapter Six of the backbone narratives which undergird FM allows us to conduct a more sophisticated examination of the evolution of a local tradition of early Arabic history-writing than has previously been attempted. Though we cannot definitively evaluate Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s selectivity when dealing with these backbone accounts, the fact that they make up coherent narratives, with each extract found in FM generally following on from the last sentence of the previous extract, strongly suggests that he replicated them in full. This allows us to tentatively outline each earlier account’s scope and content, discuss its apparent origin as described in the *isnād-riwāya*, and seek to historicise the different ideas inherent in each account in the context of the time it originated, and the biographies of the people who generated and transmitted it. Furthermore, by observing the point at which these originally separate accounts start to be transmitted in parallel by the same scholars, we may use the *isnāds* to trace when these accounts were combined by later scholars into the larger bodies of text to which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had access, shedding light on the development of more ambitious historical compilations in the ‘Abbāsid period which predated FM.

Our ability to outline the nature of the sources from which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam built his text also offers us powerful tools for examining his authorship. His scrupulous use of the *isnād* in FM enables us to examine exactly when and how he wove new material into these pre-existing texts which formed the framework of his historical narrative. By seeing how he supplemented his source-texts, we can develop better-informed hypotheses about the significances those texts held for him, the flaws in them which he sought to redress, and how he used his authorial agency to introduce new material to shape his readers’ responses to this information, even within the textually conservative tradition of *isnād-khabar* historical writing. Finally, our ability to identify which sections of FM were based on earlier texts also allows us to see where Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam compiled or wrote genuinely new textual units whose arrangements and contents can be more closely attributed to his agency. This allows us to see better the particular purposes that he had in mind when composing FM, and how he recast the pre-existing tradition of *futūḥ*-writing which he was working with, by adding new topics to it. Thus, the painstaking work we have just undertaken, of un-teasing Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial methods, now allows us to effectively expose and analyse the different techniques of re-use, re-appropriation, and composition which made up Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s historical practice. This will be the subject of Part III of this dissertation. We will begin by demonstrating exactly how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam put together the pre-Islamic history of Egypt which was discussed in chapters Two and Three.

PART III

Stratigraphy: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s method in practice

Part III: Introduction

Now that we have looked at Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s working methods, and tested whether the claims made in his *isnāds* about the earlier origin of his material are correct, I argue that we are justified in using the *isnāds* of FM as a guide to the real origins of his material. We are now ready to embark upon the task of using these *isnāds* to dig into the historical origins of the ideas and arguments which we inspected in Part I of this thesis. Thus, we will inspect FM’s sections on the pre-Islamic history of Egypt and the conquest, identifying his major sources for each, outlining their nature, and asking what his interventions in these pre-existing texts when writing FM tell us about the extent of his authorial contribution to different sections of FM, which arguments were implicit in narrative configurations which he had inherited from earlier packages of information, and which he had constructed anew through juxtaposition of previously unrelated material.

Chapter Seven:

Of king-lists and *qışaṣ*: Excavating *Futūḥ Miṣr*'s pre-Islamic history

The Structure of the *Juz*

In the first half of this dissertation we inspected the function of the pre-Islamic history of Egypt within FM at some length. Here we will return to that section and ask what the sources were which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used to construct this history which tied the Muslim conquest of Egypt in a wider sacred history and implicitly cast that conquest as the culmination of a long succession of interactions of prophesy with Egypt. It should be noted that this section is explicitly demarcated in the manuscripts as the first of the seven parts (*ajzāʾ*) which make up the whole book.¹ We shall see that this demarcation of the book into parts is not only topical but also reflects Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's use of different sources and methods when writing on different subjects.

FM's pre-Islamic part can be further divided into three sub-sections: an introductory section which presents Egypt's location in the world and the merits of both its human population and natural features;² a section which describes a continuous vision of Egypt's history from the resettlement of the world after the flood of Noah to Heraclius' victory over

¹ Torrey, *Conquest of Egypt*, p. 9.

² FM 1-7.

Sassanian Persia;³ and a final section describing the construction of Alexandria and its marvels.⁴ Each sub-section in turn draws on distinct sources.

1. Coptic *Dhimma* and Egyptian *faḍā'il*

I have treated the wider function of the introductory '*dhimma-raḥim*' hadith – Muḥammad's instruction to the Muslims to treat the Copts well after the conquest – at length already in this thesis. To present this injunction – through multiple lines of transmission to the same hadith and its variant forms, and by providing complementary hadiths – Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam drew on a range of different authorities, naming thirteen different individuals as his direct informants (i.e. from whom he himself had heard the tradition). However, one of these informants predominates.⁵ 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama (d. 224/838-9), Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's most commonly used source in FM, is cited at the head of nine different *isnāds* for five discrete reports on this topic.⁶ In fact, in FM there are only seven discrete reports on this topic, and therefore only two types for which Ibn Maslama does not provide a narration.⁷ Ibn Maslama relates his narrations from five different informants, showing that unlike Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam he was not reliant on one main collector, strongly suggesting that it was he who collected together this body of hadiths on the Copts. Thus, we can conclude that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam took this topical bundle, assembled by Ibn Maslama, and made it the introduction to his work, further emphasising it by finding and reproducing alternative

³ FM 7-37.

⁴ FM 37-44.

⁵ See FM 2-4. For the direct authorities invoked on these pages, consult the table in the appendix.

⁶ I am using the term discrete to distinguish between multiple parallel narrations to variants of the same report, and fundamentally different (discrete) reports on the topic.

⁷ The exceptions are FM p. 3, l. 9 and p. 4, l. 6.

lines of transmission to the same reports which he had learned from his main teacher. It should be noted that Ibn Maslama is not a major informant for the other bodies of material in the pre-Islamic section of the history, and therefore Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s use of this report on the Copts as a preface to the ancient history of Egypt is indeed an innovative intervention into the representation of this body of information.

Having emphasised the protected status of the Copts, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam presents a series of *faḍā’il*-type reports which praise the land of Egypt on the basis of its observable marvels⁸ as well as the historic wonders performed there mentioned in the Koran.⁹ The cultivated bounty of Egypt is related to specific Koranic passages.¹⁰ While most of these reports came indirectly from Ibn Lahī‘a (d. 174/790-1), Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had to use several different *isnāds* to cite Ibn Lahī‘a on this topic. This suggests that Ibn Lahī‘a had not taught this material as a package: if he had, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam could have related it all from one of Ibn Lahī‘a’s students to whom transmitted it as such. Rather, it was Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam who brought together these references to Egypt’s wonders, to be combined with Ibn Maslama’s bundle of material about the Copts, in order to construct what he thought was a fitting opening section to his book.

⁸ E.g. FM 5, ll. 4-6: ‘whoso desires to look on the similitude of paradise should look to Egypt in the autumn’.

⁹ E.g. FM 5, ll. 6-8: ‘of them were the sorcerers [who contested Moses]; they found belief all together at one time; we do not know of a community which converted instantaneously more numerous than that of the Copts’.

¹⁰ E.g. FM ‘the whole of the land of Egypt in its entirety used to be irrigated from sixteen cubits [of the Nile flood] through means of the aqueducts, canals, and dykes which they prepared and managed. This is what is referred to by the speech of God: “How many were the gardens and the watersprings that they left behind”[Q 44:25]’. Sixteen cubits was the ideal height of the Nile flood, see Sijpesteijn, *Shaping*, p. 20.

2. From Noah to Heraclius

After the *faḍā'il* of Egypt and its people, FM narrates the story of Egypt from the deep, biblical past right up to end of the last great war of antiquity.¹¹ For this long and fascinating vision of Egypt's pre-Islamic history, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam mostly relies on two direct informants: 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ and Asad b. Mūsā. From pages seven to thirty-six, 'Uthmān or Asad are the primary informants in forty-five – over half – of the eighty-six *isnāds*.¹² Furthermore, their accounts are often much longer than the brief texts attached to some other citations. For example, from line nine of page seven to line two of page fourteen, Asad and 'Uthmān furnish 101 of 139 lines of text despite heading of only thirteen of the total twenty-six *isnāds*. Thus, while they only provide half of the citations, they are the source of over 70% of the actual text. This is representative of the section as a whole. 'Uthmān's account provides the narrative skeleton of the section, providing a continuous king-list to which he appends brief notices on events of ancient Egyptian history and the prophets' activities in Egypt, before recounting the domination of Rome and Persia over Egypt.¹³ Asad taught Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam quite different information: haggadic stories of the lives of the prophets, with no relation to the chronological or mundane context in which they occurred.

¹¹ Borrowing James Howard-Johnston's term for the last Persian-Roman war of 602-28. On which see his, *East Rome, Sasanian Persia and the end of antiquity: Historiographical and historical studies* (Aldershot, 2006).

¹² 'Uthmān is cited twenty times, Asad twenty-five. Again, this can be gleaned from the table in the appendix.

¹³ The king-list begins at pp. 9-10. The last 'king-list' section is given p. 30. At p. 33 we see 'Uthmān's account transition into a story of Roman and Persian domination.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam wove Asad’s stories, as well as a scattering of other prophetic, historical, and folkloric tales, around the frame provided by ‘Uthmān’s account, altering both the significance of the haggadic material which he placed in a new narrative context, and that of ‘Uthmān’s backbone account which he supplemented. The effects he created through the juxtaposition of these originally distinct bodies of material are fundamental clues to his authorial activity and intent in this section.

3. Building Alexandria

The final section of the *juz’* is an eight-page collection of reports about Alexandria, relating traditions about Alexander, his foundation of the city, and its *‘ajā’ib* (*mirabilia*).¹⁴ In this subsection, as with that on the *faḍā’il* of Egypt, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam has no predominant source. In the thirty *isnāds* which he cites, he uses only one direct informant more than three times, and relates directly from eighteen different individuals.¹⁵ Here, he is not reusing a previous scholar’s thematic collection of reports, as he did with Ibn Maslama’s hadiths on the Copts, ‘Uthmān’s account of Egyptian history from Noah-to-Heraclius, or Asad’s ‘stories-of-prophet’ with which he supplemented it. Rather, the *isnāds* show him crafting this section himself from information gathered from different teachers. Therefore, in the Alexandria section, even as he quotes the words of his predecessors, he does so to create a new body of information.

¹⁴ FM 37-44.

¹⁵ Again, see the appendix for the *isnāds*. The exception is Asad, cited five times: FM 42, l. 8; p. 43, ll. 6, 18; p. 44, ll. 11, 14. However, Asad does not here provide the extended narratives which we find earlier in the *juz’*, rather one-word glosses on Koranic topics, a snippet of poetry on the pyramids, and a short notice on a legendary found-inscription: it is certainly not the basis of the section.

The different ways in which the *isnāds* show us Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam reusing text are fundamental to understanding his authorship. As discussed in my introduction, it is becoming a commonplace to say that it is unsustainable to view ninth-century Arabic historians' activity as unthinking compilation. Structure and order is apparent in the texts we read, and this is no accident. However, the identification of pre-existing bodies of information which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam redeployed shows us that we cannot just loosely invoke the principles of selection and arrangement, ignore the *isnāds*, perform a holistic reading of a given text, and ascribe the productions of meaning thus identified to the compiler's authorial agency.¹⁶ Rather, we must excavate these texts stratigraphically, exposing the different textures of reuse at different levels. The pre-Islamic history in *Futūḥ Miṣr* is a prime example. The notion of writing an Egypt-centred pre-Islamic history in Arabic, chronologically coordinated by a continuous king-list, was not the innovation of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam; we see it was already wholly present in the material transmitted to him by his teacher ʿUthmān. Therefore, to read its existence simply as an expression of his authorial agency would be a mistake. The appropriate context in which to historicise its generation must be sought elsewhere. Nevertheless, it was still an authorial choice to adopt and incorporate this pre-existing narrative into his own work. Thus, it must be analysed as an act of reuse rather than generation, with careful attention paid to the other material

¹⁶ The 'surface-reading' in Part I explicitly stated that the arguments which I was identifying were part of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's historical world-view, rather than explicitly ascribing them to his authorial agency. For an example of scholarship trying to understand techniques of composition, see F. Donner, 'ʿUthmān and the Rāshidūn Caliphs in Ibn ʿAsākir's *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq*: A study in the strategies of compilation', in Lindsay (ed.), *Ibn ʿAsākir and Early Islamic History* (Princeton, 2001), pp. 44-61.

which he chose to add to it, which offers vital clues to his perception of its meanings and his attempts to remould them.

The following is my attempt at such a stratigraphic reading, which seeks to outline as best we can the nature and extent of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s sources for his pre-Islamic history, what he did with them, and what that tells us about his purposes in writing FM. Firstly I present the nature of the source which provides the narrative backbone of FM’s pre-Islamic history, in the sub-section titled ‘Uthmān’s narrative skeleton’. Secondly, in the section titled ‘Supplementing ‘Uthmān I: Fleshing out the skeleton’, I show how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam augmented ‘Uthmān’s story by introducing narrations of the same events from other sources. I also analyse how these parallel narrations differ from ‘Uthmān’s account in both their form and their origin. I propose that their content displays little thematic unity, and that the reason for their inclusion in the text is to provide epistemological ballast for ‘Uthmān’s account rather than alter its implications. In the next section, ‘Supplementing ‘Uthmān II: Adding to the story’, I inspect those occasions when Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduces episodes not included in ‘Uthmān’s basic narrative. I argue that this material must be read in a different way to the ‘parallel narrations’ inspected in the preceding section, and that their common themes expose Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s conscious intention to use this pre-Islamic history to add a sacred gloss to Egypt’s landscape.

‘Uthmān’s narrative skeleton

Then Miṣr b. Bayṣar died and his son Qifṭ b. Miṣr succeeded him. Then Qifṭ b. Miṣr died and his brother Ashmun b. Miṣr succeeded him. Then Ashmun b. Miṣr died and his brother Atrīb b. Miṣr succeeded him. Then Atrīb b. Miṣr died and his brother Ṣā b. Miṣr succeeded him. Then Ṣā b. Miṣr died and his son Tudāris b. Ṣā succeeded him. Then Tudāris b. Ṣā died and his son Mālīq b. Tudāris succeeded him . . .¹⁷

Thus ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ continues the history of Egypt, having told us that Bayṣar, the cursed son of Ḥām, and his redeemed son Miṣr, were the first settlers of Egypt after the Flood, and the forefathers of all the Egyptians.¹⁸ These ‘succession notes’ are a constant part of ‘Uthmān’s account, recurring at pp. 12 (‘Ṭuṭīs b. Māliyā died and his daughter Kharūbā succeeded...’), 18 (‘al-Rayyān b. al-Walīd died and his son Dārim b. al-Rayyān ruled them after him...’), 19 (‘Kāsham b. Ma‘dān ruled them after him...’), 26 (‘their opinion was united to appoint to authority a woman among them named Dalūka bt. Zabbā’...’), 28-9 (‘then DRKWN b. BLWṬS died and his son Būdis b. DRKWN succeeded him...’), and 30 (‘then Marīnūs b. Bawla succeeded...’). These succession-notes only occur within *matns* (textual units) ascribed to ‘Uthmān’s account. Pieced together, the (fictional) rulers named in this account make an unbroken chain from Noah’s sons to the conquest of Egypt by the Romans. The account goes on to describe Roman rule in Egypt until the conclusion of the last Roman-Persian war. It was originally a whole, coherent account, giving a vision of all of pre-Islamic history in Egypt. It is the backbone of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s chronologically linear narration of pre-Islamic Egyptian history. The supplementary stories which Ibn ‘Abd

¹⁷ FM 9-10.

¹⁸ Outlined in FM 7, l. 10 – p. 8, l. 13. For a fuller discussion of this episode, see Chapter Two.

al-Ḥakam adds to it usually expand on events which it has already been used to note, or at least occur in the time-scale established by the king list.

1. The *riwāya-isnād*

What do I mean when I call it ‘Uthmān’s account’? I am following FM’s terminology, where we find these *matns* introduced with the formulaic statement: ‘He said: Then he returned to the account (*ḥadīth*) of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ and another. He said . . .’¹⁹ We are being told that at this point in his dictation, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam returned to an account which he had learned from ‘Uthmān and someone else.²⁰ As we saw in the preceding chapter, these ‘returns’ are how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam indicates that he is using a continuous, pre-existing account into which he has interwoven various reports and comments which he thought relevant to the story he was building from that original narrative. As in the cases which we observed then, in the first instance where he uses this account, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam provides a full citation for this backbone narrative, the *riwāya-isnād*:

‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ and Yaḥyā b. Khālīd related to us on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd, one of the two of them adding more than the other. Sometimes ‘Uthmān used to say: Khālīd b. Najīḥ related to us on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd. They said . . . [the account begins]²¹

¹⁹ *qāla thumma raja‘a ilā ḥadīthi ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ wa-ghayrihi qāla...* This phrase is used at FM 12, l. 12; 13, l. 16; 19, l. 8; 23, l. 2; 26, l. 15; 30, l. 15; 33, l. 19, occasionally dropping ‘Uthmān’s patronymic. The subject of the initial *qāla* is Ibn Qudayd, to whom all manuscript traditions return, and who, according to the conceit of the text, is relaying Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s speech.

²⁰ Occasionally the reference is to an account of ‘Uthmān without the mention of ‘someone else’: FM 18, l. 14; 19, l. 13; 27, l. 12.

²¹ FM 8, l. 21 – 9, l. 3. *ḥaddathanī ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ wa-Yaḥyā b. Khālīd ‘an Ibn Lahī‘a wa-‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd yazīdu aḥaduhumā ‘alā ṣāḥibihi wa-qad kāna ‘Uthmān rubbamā qāla ḥaddathanī Khālīd b. Najīḥ ‘an Ibn Lahī‘a wa-‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd qālū...*

The report which follows includes the first instance of the ‘succession-notices’ which are a continual theme of the reports from the ‘Uthmān-account’ in the pre-Islamic history, and therefore this *riwāya-isnād* can clearly be associated with these other reports. The phrase, *ḥadīth ‘Uthmān wa-ghayrihi* is shorthand for ‘the account of ‘Uthmān and Yaḥyā’. This is further suggested by one reference which states ‘Uthmān and *ghayruhu* said in their account (*fī ḥadīthihimā*)’, using the dual possessive pronoun, thus demonstrating that the *ghayruhu* indicates one specific person (Yaḥyā), rather than amorphous ‘others’.²²

The structure of this *riwāya-isnād* is slightly more complex than the others we have observed, having two people at both levels of the *isnād* (‘Uthmān as Yaḥyā as his direct informants, Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd as their informants). While we are clearly dealing with a coherent text – as shown by the contiguous king-list – it is hard to see immediately who amalgamated it into that unified form. The key to understanding this, I believe, is Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s comment that ‘Uthmān ‘sometimes’ (*rubbamā*) said that Khālīd b. Najīḥ was the intermediary informant who taught him Ibn Lahī‘a and Ibn Khālīd’s information.

Khālīd b. Najīḥ (d. 204/819-20) was an older contemporary of ‘Uthmān (d. 219/834-5) but younger than Ibn Lahī‘a (d. 174/790-1). If Khālīd could teach ‘Uthmān an account on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘a and Ibn Khālīd, this suggests that Khālīd had amalgamated their teachings into a single account. Other, younger students of Ibn Lahī‘a and Ibn Khālīd, like

²² FM 13, ll. 9-10.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s direct informants for this account ‘Uthmān and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālid, would have used their contemporary Khālid’s amalgamation as the form in which they transmitted their teachers’ lectures. The fact that Khālid b. Najīḥ taught his younger contemporaries reports from their shared teachers is explicitly stated in a critical biographical notice on ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ:

[‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ] used to write *ḥadīths* with Khālid b. Najīḥ. Now when they were learning from the teacher, Khālid used to dictate to them things that they themselves had not heard.²³

The scenario which best fits ‘Uthmān’s occasional citation of Khālid to Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh is that Khālid produced an amalgamated account based on the teachings of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh, which was then taken up and transmitted by younger students such as ‘Uthmān and Yaḥyā. This is why ‘Uthmān sometimes cited Khālid as his authority for the account which Khālid had arranged. However, the fact that ‘Uthmān was old enough to have heard the teachings of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh which Khālid had amalgamated into a unified form meant that ‘Uthmān sometimes cited the original teachers directly as the source of the content, without acknowledging that the form in which he was transmitting it had been established by Khālid. In this reading, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s other authority for the account, Yaḥyā b. Khālid,²⁴ would have been transmitting a version of the same notes. This

²³ TD 29/186.

²⁴ About whom the biographical dictionaries are unfortunately silent. I would suggest that he is listed in the biographical dictionaries as Khalaf b. Khālid, d. 215, who as a *mawlā* of Quraysh could plausibly have had the *nisba* al-‘Adawī which our Yaḥyā b. Khālid has (see FM 15, 53, 72). See TI 5/307-8, also TKAR 8/283-4, for the two individuals whose identity seems confused, at least according to al-Dhahabī. This Khalaf is said to have related from the same people we find Yaḥyā relating in FM, e.g. Ibn Lahī‘a (FM 8, 15, 53), al-Layth (FM 57, 72, 137), and Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb (FM 53), though we do see Yaḥyā twice relating in FM from teachers al-Dhahabī does not list for Khalaf (FM 79, 90).

explains why Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam cites them both (*‘Uthmān wa-ghayruhu fī ḥadīthihimā*) as if they were transmitting the same *matns*. Thus, the ‘account of ‘Uthmān’ should be thought of not as ‘Uthmān’s individual work, but rather a set of notes amalgamating the lectures on pre-Islamic history of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd. These notes were shared by their students, who sometimes ascribed their content directly to Ibn Lahī‘a and Ibn Khālīd, though their form was originally established by Khālīd b. Najīḥ. Nevertheless, for convenience, I will follow FM in terming it ‘‘Uthmān’s account’. If my reading of the *riwāya-isnād* is correct, the form of this account was achieved before 204/819-20 (Khālīd’s death), and its content reflects lectures being given on Egyptian history at least before 174/790-1 (Ibn Lahī‘a’s death).

2. The nature of ‘Uthmān’s pre-Islamic history

In any case, the exact origins and formation of ‘Uthmān’s pre-Islamic account are secondary to the main point, that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used a continuous, chronologically ordered account of pre-Islamic Egyptian history as the backbone narrative of this section. What can we say, then, about this account, whose contours were formed in the second half of the eighth century? Firstly, it appears to have no basis in either historical reality, nor in pre-Islamic written accounts. This can be contrasted to Arabic accounts of ancient Persian history, which although mythologised and for the earlier periods unrelated to reality, were a reproduction of a Sassanian vision of the Iranian past. Eusebius in the fourth century had accessed the real Pharaonic king-list through the Hellenistic author Manetho, which

entered the Arabic tradition via al-Bīrūnī (d. 440/1048).²⁵ However, ‘Uthmān’s king-list – which would prove much more successful in the Arabic tradition – bears no relation to this, nor to any pre-Islamic account of Egyptian history of which I am aware. A clue to the origin of this information may lie in the conclusion to the account’s story of the Egyptian king ‘Bawla’, which states that this king, in his deposed and maddened state, is the origin of a Coptic saying, which is then given in Coptic transliterated into Arabic.²⁶ Ibn Lahī‘a is said to have gained the nickname *Dhū -l-kharīṭa* – ‘the guy with the leather bag’²⁷ – for his habit of roving around Egypt with a document wallet writing down whatever he could from the *shaykhs* he met.²⁸ One can imagine such a character encountering informal Egyptian traditions about ancient rulers and using them to populate his king-list, though such a hypothesis is of course speculative.

However, it is the will to present a knowledge of all of Egyptian history which is the most remarkable feature of the account, rather than its content. In producing it, Ibn Lahī‘a and those who followed him claimed to be able to know and characterise all of Egyptian history, not merely Islamic Egyptian history, and thus make universal claims about how history worked in Egypt. However, they rejected the scheme of ordering ancient time most obviously available in Egypt; the Christian chronicle tradition which built on the Hellenistic synchronisation of different cultures’ ancient chronologies. The early Christian chroniclers,

²⁵ All points made by M. Cook, ‘Pharonic History in Medieval Egypt’, *Studia Islamica* 57 (1983), pp. 70-1.

²⁶ FM 30, l. 13-14.

²⁷ Or, ‘the bagman’ for short. I owe this epithet to Theo Beers.

²⁸ SAN 8/23.

most influentially Eusebius, building on the work of Julius Africanus, had inherited the Jewish position in the Jewish-Greek polemic over the relative antiquity of Moses versus Plato. To refute pagan claims that Moses had plagiarised Plato, comparative chronologies were adduced to assert that Moses predated him and that the philosopher was in fact influenced by the prophet.²⁹ This chronological exactitude retained its relevance as Christian apocalyptic thought concerned itself with the conclusion of the sixth millennium since the creation of the world, which needed to be dated via careful correlation of the genealogical information and ages found in the Torah. Even as the apocalypse failed to (de-)materialise and Christian chronicles like John Malalas' sixth century history became more narratively driven, the Eusebian chronological frame still underpinned the tradition.³⁰

One can find similarly obsessive accounts of the age of the earth, derived from king-lists and reign-lengths, in the Arabic tradition. For example, Abū Ma'shar (d. 272/866), a contemporary of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam operating in Baghdad, could offer critical comments on the different ages of the earth propounded by the Jews, Christians, Persians, and astrologers, and the history of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī in which these are preserved consistently offers the length of individual ancient Persian rulers' reigns in order to calculate the period of their

²⁹ The pagans had argued that Moses' teachings were plagiarised from Plato, while the Jews counter-argued the opposite. A. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen, 1989), particularly pp. 59-64.

³⁰ Brian Croke, "The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle," in his *Christian Chronicles and Byzantine History 5th-6th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1992), III, 116-31; Brian Croke, "Byzantine Chronicle Writing: The early development of Byzantine chronicles," in Elizabeth Jeffreys, Brian Croke, and Roger Scott (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (Sydney, 1990), 27-38. For Julius Africanus see the introduction and bibliography in Julius Africanus, *Chronography*, ed. Martin Wallraff and tr. William Adler, *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments* (New York, 2007).

dynasties' dominion.³¹ Likewise, the *Book of Knowledges* (*Kitāb al-Ma'ārif*) by Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) records the ages of the prophets and the lengths of the intervals between their missions in an attempt to comprehend a temporal totality.³² In contrast, while 'Uthmān's account occasionally tells us the length of ancient Egyptian rulers' reigns, this information is not provided systematically, nor is any attempt ever made to calculate a total of the time covered by the account. The reign-lengths in this account satisfy the formal characteristics of authoritative history-writing about ancient times without fulfilling the function which these elements were originally generated to serve. By the later eighth century no-one seriously argued that Moses had copied his stuff from Plato, and Islamic millennial speculation worked from a different calendar to that of the Christians.³³ And unlike Abū Ma'shar in Baghdād or Ḥamza in Iṣfahān, Ibn Lahī'a and his companions chose not to engage with or translate the historical literature of the imperial culture previously dominant in their region. Their project was not cosmopolitan, nor did they use pre-existing ancient history-writing to position themselves as the inheritors of the culture of previous civilisations, rather they used some of its formal features to forward their own agenda.

The ordering of time in 'Uthmān's account is entirely linked to the rule of political authority in Egypt. A king dies, and his relative succeeds. In the vast majority of the account, the ruler is the only grammatical subject, and their acts are either of *mulk* or *istikhlāf*. The implication is that Egypt is a perennial historical object, always ruled as a single entity. This

³¹ See U.M. Daudpota (tr.), *The Annals of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī*, (Bombay, 1932), pp. 2-7, 10-18.

³² R. Tottoli, *Biblical prophets in the Qur'ān and Muslim Literature* (London, 2002), p. 131.

³³ See D. Cook, *Studies in Muslim apocalyptic* (Princeton, 2002).

form of organising time reinforces the paradigm established by the story that Egypt was divinely granted to the descendants of Miṣr, great-grandson of Noah by way of Ḥām, which is recounted at the beginning of FM also on the authority of ‘Uthmān from Ibn Lahī’a.³⁴ As such, it is ruled initially by descendants of Miṣr, until it is conquered by Amalekite kings.³⁵ This fits into the paradigm established in the same story which establishes earthly dominion in the sons of Shem. The Amalekites were considered sons of Shem, a fact justified in FM by a gloss taken from Ibn Ishāq’s *Sīra*, as we have seen.³⁶

In any case, this ceaseless political existence of Egypt is the means by which time is synchronised in this account. The stories of the prophets who interact with Egypt is placed into the context of these Egyptian rulers without much fanfare. We learn that ‘Tūṭīs b. MALYA succeeded, and it was he who gave Hagar to Sarah, the wife of Abraham’, which is all ‘Uthmān’s account has to say about Abraham.³⁷ It is as close as one could get to an annal-entry on a biblical event. On Joseph, the entirety of the account can be reconstructed as:

Al-Rayyān b. al-Walīd b. Dawmagh, who was the master of Joseph the prophet, ruled them after him. When the king had the vision which Joseph also saw and interpreted, the king sent for him and brought him forth from jail. When he questioned him and asked him, Joseph became great in Pharaoh’s estimation and exalted in his heart. He gave him his seal and put him in charge of all affairs beyond his court. He seated him on the throne and the king entered his

³⁴ FM 7. In this case the *isnād* goes further, continuing from Ibn Lahī’a to < - ‘Ayyāsh b. ‘Abbās al-Qītānī - Ḥanash > . I believe that Ibn Lahī’a incorporated this properly *isnād*-verified report into what was largely an unattributed narration, in the same way that al-Wāqidī would incorporate *isnād*-verified reports into *al-Maghāzī*, which as we have seen was largely his own amalgamation of the teachers in the ‘collective *isnād*’ at the beginning of the account. See my discussion of this in Chapter Six, above, pp. 190-1.

³⁵ FM 12.

³⁶ FM 12, l. 17.

³⁷ FM 10, ll. 4-5.

house with his women, entrusting the care of all Egypt to him. Joseph ruled because of his interpretation of the king's vision.³⁸

While fuller, this is still a very terse version of the story laid out in the Torah and Koran, with no explanation of Joseph's being in jail, or the content of Pharaoh's dream. With the events of Exodus, 'Uthmān's account returns to the more non-narrative annalistic style:

Then God drowned Pharaoh and his notables in the sea when they followed the Israelites. When he drowned him he drowned along with him more than a million of the nobility, notables, and leaders of the people of Egypt.³⁹

This extreme brevity demonstrates that elucidating the stories of Abraham, Joseph, and Moses in Egypt is not a main concern of this account. Rather, these figures appear in order to locate the story of Egypt within a particular historical universe – that of the Israelite prophets – without drawing on its story-telling potential in depth.

This is not to say that the account of the Egyptian kings is any fuller. Generally, we only have a name followed by their death and the next succession, perhaps with a reign-length. The only non-biblical expansions of these lists describe the descent of certain kings into tyranny and their death as a divinely-ordained punishment. Thus the pharaoh who ruled after Joseph's death 'was proud and proclaimed idol-worship. He sailed the Nile in a boat and God sent a raging wind upon him and it drowned him and those with him'.⁴⁰ These incidents do not become the occasion of lurid story-telling of the ills of tyranny. Rather,

³⁸ FM 13.

³⁹ FM 23.

⁴⁰ FM 19.

they are repeatedly expressed in a single verb, *ṭaghā*, meaning ‘to exceed just limits’, generally accompanied by the verb *takabbara*, ‘to be haughty and consider oneself above the rights of others’. The public manifestation (*iẓhār*) of shocking crimes (*fāḥisha*) and idol-worship (*‘ibādat al-aṣṇām*) complete these stereotypical rather than particular images of unjust pre-Islamic rule.⁴¹ God is the providential force directing history – he wreaks destruction on those who overstep the bounds – but Egypt’s people appear essentially abused by their rulers.

We should read this sparse story-line in the light of the story which seems to have prefaced ‘Uthmān’s account, just as it prefates the pre-Islamic history of Egypt in FM, that of the sons of Noah. It is the narrative fulfilment of the idea that the Egyptians, as descendants of Ḥām, are cursed to servility, and do not have the divinely-imbued capacity for kingship or prophesy. Therefore, left to their own devices, they will suffer the invasion of foreign peoples (the Amalekites) and the rule of tyrants. They may occasionally be able to overthrow a particular despot, but ultimately ‘Uthmān’s account ascribes no positive agency to Egyptian self-rule.⁴² The appeal of the idea that the natives can’t rule themselves to an Arab Muslim minority imposing its authority over the population is obvious.

While the pattern so far described is accurate for the early stages of ‘Uthmān’s account, there are two occasions when narrative breaks out from being this scarcely augmented

⁴¹ FM 12, l. 17; 19, ll. 8, 11; 29, ll. 2, 7.

⁴² FM 29, ll. 2-3 for the overthrow.

king-list. The first is the story of the events in Egypt after Pharaoh pursued Moses into the Red Sea, which I call the ‘Consequences of Exodus’ narrative.⁴³ The second is that once the Romans occupy Egypt no further attempt is made to provide a king-list, or much of a historical account. We learn that the Egyptians were under the *dhimma* of the Romans and paid them a fixed sum to them each year, thus establishing that Egypt’s subjection to Rome was akin to its subjection to the Muslims, and an extremely curtailed version of the last Roman-Persian war is recounted.⁴⁴ It is explicitly noted that these final events recounted took place ‘in the era of Messenger of God, before his death, after the coming of Islam’, synchronising the events of prophetic time with those in Egypt just as in the earlier sections.

The consequences-of-Exodus account is that which tells us that literally all the free or noble Egyptian men drowned in the Red Sea, leaving the country defenceless. The Egyptian noblewomen elected one of their number, Dalūka, to be queen.⁴⁵ As noted in chapter three, she resolved the repopulation problem by having her and her noblewomen marry wage-labourers and slaves. To resolve the security issue, she constructed fortifications around the entire country and engaged a mighty sorceress to build the ancient temples (*birbā*, pl. *barābī*) of Egypt. The images of men, cavalry, or boats which these contained would move when a corresponding enemy army attacked, which could then be slain by the destruction of the image. The functions of this story in denigrating Coptic men as slaves to their women

⁴³ FM 26-30.

⁴⁴ FM 33.

⁴⁵ For an initial analysis of this account, see Sijpesteijn, ‘Building an Egyptian identity’.

and explaining the origin and destruction of the ruined temples of Egypt have already been noted. While it is stylistically distinct from the rest of ‘Uthmān’s account, the *isnāds* attached to it suggest that it was a part of that account. Further, later sections of ‘Uthmān’s king-list refer back to this story:

Then he died and his brother Luqās b. Marīnūs succeeded. Whenever any of these temples within which the images were fell apart no-one could repair them except for that old woman and her sons and their progeny . . . But the descent of this family-line was cut off and a part of the temple fell off during the time of Luqās b. Marīnūs and none was able to repair it nor knew its science so it remained in its [broken] condition. Thus, that by which they had been victorious over the [other] people was cut off and they became like all others except that their army was numerous and they possessed great wealth.⁴⁶

This passage clearly rounds off the consequences-of-Exodus story: the reversal of the Red-Sea fiasco forced the queen to take radical actions, the most extraordinary of which are ultimately resolved with a return of the status quo, with the origin of various curiosities of Egypt being explained along the way. This decisively demonstrates that ‘Uthmān’s account did have at least some narrative competence and was a unified account in which the reader was expected to be able to refer events back and forth to their causes and consequences.

Supplementing ‘Uthmān I: Fleshing out the skeleton

The preceding section shows that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had an account to hand which arranged all of Egyptian history before Muḥammad’s mission into chronological order

⁴⁶ FM 30, ll. 16-21.

through political succession, and which carried particular messages about Egypt and its indigenous population. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was not content simply to repeat this account and move on to the events of the conquest however. While ‘Uthmān’s account remained the framework for pre-Islamic Egyptian time in FM, the additions which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam made to this narrative show us where he thought ‘Uthmān’s account was lacking and how it should be supplemented, offering clues to his aims for this section of his work.

1. Asad’s *qīṣaṣ*

The most usual supplement Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam made was to introduce accounts taught to him by Asad b. Mūsā (d. 212/827-8), a grandson of the short-tenured Umayyad caliph Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd.⁴⁷ Born in al-Baṣra in the same year as the fall of the Umayyad dynasty, Asad travelled widely in pursuit of knowledge and settled in Egypt. Biographical and bibliographical sources tell us that he authored a hadith collection, a book on the merits of the Successors (*tābī‘īn*), a *risāla* to one Asad b. al-Furāt, and a book on asceticism, which last is extant.⁴⁸ This *Kitāb al-zuhd* has been analysed as a unique and somewhat morose early book in the *zuhd* genre, consisting of prophetic traditions with no instructions on how to live the pious life but rather being ‘almost entirely related to God’s punishment and the Day

⁴⁷ For Asad: *TI* 5/275-6; *TKIR* 2/512-4; *HM* 1/346; *TKB* 2/49; *ITK* 2/126-7; *SAN* 10/162; *MI* 1/207. See also the discussion and references to primary and secondary literature in R. Khoury, ‘Asad b. Mūsā b. Ibrāhīm’, *EI*2.

⁴⁸ Ibn Khayr in sixth/twelfth century Spain had seen all three, *FIK* 118-9, 236-7, and Ibn Ḥajar in ninth/fifteenth century Egypt had *al-Zuhd* and *Faḍā’il al-tābī‘īn*, *FIH* 89, 92. Ibn al-Nadīm, in fourth/tenth century Bagdhād was unaware of him, suggesting that his impact was felt only in the Islamic west. See bibliography for details of the editions.

of Judgment’.⁴⁹ However, the material from Asad found in FM does not match what we know of these works.⁵⁰

Whereas ‘Uthmān’s account ties everything back to its fabricated Egyptian king-list, Asad’s reports in FM are concentrated on what came to be known in Arabic as *qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*: stories of the Israelites which are closely related to information in the Koran, Torah, or apocryphal Judaeo-Christian narratives about the prophets.⁵¹ Asad does not tell us anything which diverges notably from what can be found in the Torah.⁵² His stories seem to have no unusual concern for their implications for Egypt, or the Egyptians, in contrast to, for example, ‘Uthmān’s ‘consequences-of-Exodus’ narrative. Asad never uses the name of an Egyptian king, nor does he provide any of the legendary information linking Joseph to the canals of Egypt. He never uses the term ‘Copts’, or even ‘the people of Egypt’, and certainly does not discuss Muḥammad’s *waṣīyya* towards them. Nor does he contribute to the *faḍā’il* of Egypt. Thus, he is absent from the narrative of pp. 1-9. Likewise, once the major biblical stories are finished with Exodus he practically disappears from the narrative in pp. 26-45. He contributes no imaginative stories of invented Egyptian kings or sorceresses, no apocryphal stories of the prophets in Egypt, no descriptions of ancient administrative arrangements, and nothing of the history of the Romans and the Persians. But between pp.

⁴⁹ Feryal Salem, ‘Ibn al-Mubārak between *ḥadīth*, *jihād*, and *zuhd*’ (University of Chicago PhD dissertation, 2013), pp. 244-5.

⁵⁰ Contra R. Khoury, who in his article on Asad in EI2 claims that his material in FM is ‘of an ascetic and pious nature’.

⁵¹ EI2, ‘*Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*’, ‘*Isrā’īliyyāt*’.

⁵² The exceptions are a reference to Solomon’s shield on p. 29, and a couple of stories which link Alexandria to the Koranic ruler Shaddād b. ‘Ād via the narrative device of found epigraphy, pp. 42-3, and *tafsīr*-esque comments on *Sūrat al-Rūm*, p. 44.

10-26, from Abraham's entry to Egypt to Moses' departure, Asad b. Mūsā stands at the head of twenty-four of the sixty-four *isnāds*, narrating the activities of Abraham, Joseph, and Moses in Egypt. He is easily the most cited immediate informant for this part of the text. Taken together, this suggests that Asad had collected and taught a significant body of stories-of-prophets material which had no particularly Egyptian perspective.⁵³

Given the lack of interest in Egypt per se in this material, it is likely that Asad's collected a broad range of traditions about the prophets from which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam then selected whatever happened to take place in Egypt. On a couple of occasions Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam explicitly tells us that he is using Asad's account to give the 'cause' (*sabab*) of a brief notice which he has just recounted from 'Uthmān. Thus, after he uses 'Uthmān's account to tell us that '[ṬWṬYS] was he who gave Hagar to Sarah, the wife of Abraham', Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam says that 'the cause of Abraham's entry to Egypt was, as was related to us by Asad b. Mūsā, that . . .'.⁵⁴ Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was clearly using this body of material to flesh out the bare-bones references to the prophets in the rather skeletal account of 'Uthmān which served as his framework for this section of FM.

Asad's material is far more narratively accomplished than 'Uthmān's. In common stories-of-prophets fashion, we find Asad concerned to tell dramatic tales of the divine protection

⁵³ Thus, FM's citations indicate Asad's involvement in a field of scholarship with which he has not previously been associated. REF Sezgin's entry on Asad. Khoury, in his EI2 article, does not note this haggadic material either.

⁵⁴ FM 10, ll. 4-7. Exactly the same formulation is used at p. 23, ll. 2-4.

afforded to the Israelite prophets, and the astonishing reversals in their fate wrought by God's revelation. In contrast, 'Uthmān's brief prophetic-notice has little sense of tension or internal temporal progression. 'Uthmān's entire account of Abraham in Egypt reads simply, '[TWTYS] gave Hagar to Sarah, the wife of Abraham'.⁵⁵ Asad's accounts, on the other hand, add drama to their tales with sequential narration:

[Abraham] set out with Sarah, bound for Egypt. When he entered it, [Sarah's] beauty was mentioned to the king and she was described to him . . . He commanded that she be brought to him . . .').⁵⁶

They are not just longer but more vivid, including direct speech:

[The king] went for Sarah but God paralysed his hands and feet. He said to Abraham, "This is your doing."⁵⁷

His characters experience fear, lust, and other emotions, rather than 'Uthmān's, who simply perform summary deeds. Further, they experience these emotions within full narrative arcs. Asad's tale of Abraham in Egypt, as we can reconstruct it from FM, is a full story: we hear of the reason for Abraham and Sarah's coming from Mesopotamia, Sarah's beauty, the reporting of that to the king, his summons, Abraham's passivity, her jeopardy, God's intervention, her deliverance, and the resolution with the gift of Hagar, which in turn sets up the story of Ishmael. It is connected to previous events and poised to move on to the next stage of a continuous tale of prophesy.

⁵⁵ FM 10.

⁵⁶ FM 10.

⁵⁷ FM 10.

In contrast, the implications ‘Uthmān’s account draws from these prophetic events are always about the control of Egypt. The fuller account which ‘Uthmān gives of Joseph can be explained by the fact that it is all about the rule of Egypt:

[The king] gave [Joseph] his seal-ring (*khātim*) and put him in charge of everything outside his palace (*wallāhu mā khalfā bābihi*) . . . He seated him on the throne and the king entered his house with his women, entrusting the care of all Egypt to him (*fawwāḍa amra Miṣr ilayhi*). Joseph ruled (*malaka Yūsuf*) Egypt because of his interpretation of the king’s vision.⁵⁸

Asad does tell us that Joseph was made the ruler’s deputy (*khalīfa*),⁵⁹ but Joseph’s career is passed over swiftly. Any political implications in Asad’s account are secondary to the message of God’s ability to intervene through revelation to transform the condition of the apparently wretched to match their inherent virtue, expressed in this case through a focus on Joseph’s clothes:

The messenger came [to Joseph from the king] and said, “Cast off your prison clothes and dress in new clothes . . . [Later, after the dream-interpretation, the king] dressed [Joseph] with a gold necklace and silk clothes, and gave him a steed saddled and adorned as if it were the steed of the king.”⁶⁰

We note that both ‘Uthmān and Asad’s accounts incorporate elements which ultimately derive from the biblical verses on Joseph’s elevation, which are not found in the Koran’s brief statement of Joseph’s elevation. From Genesis 41:42 ‘Uthmān has the reference to Pharaoh’s seal-ring, whereas Asad has the gold chain and fine clothes, though Joseph’s

⁵⁸ FM 13.

⁵⁹ A term of significance, perhaps intended to cast the caliphs in a prophetic light. The Umayyad caliph al-Walīd II, at least, played on the fact that Adam appeared in the Koran as a *khalīfa* by iconographically representing himself as Adam. See G. Fowden, *Qusayr ‘Amra: Art and the Umayyad Elite in Late Antique Syria* (London, 2004), pp. 134-8. The prophets Adam and David are the only people termed *khalīfas* in the Koran, see Q 2:30-3, 38:26.

⁶⁰ FM 13.

biblical chariot has transmuted into a royally-outfitted horse.⁶¹ Though Asad's account incorporates more biblical detail, both versions are much condensed, focussing in on particular elements of the Torah account. Asad's God glorifies Joseph with the trappings of kingly attire, but the story ultimately demonstrates the superficiality of worldly power and its subordination to God's will; even a prisoner can wear the royal robes at God's intercession. For Asad, Joseph remains a prophet first; his appearance becomes 'as if' he is a king, maintaining his distance from that earthly role. In 'Uthmān's account, however, the distinction is rather less, focussing on Joseph's taking possession of the king's seal-ring and describing his rule using the verb *malaka*, derived from the word king (*malik*), which he also uses to describe the rule of Egypt's other rulers. For 'Uthmān, Joseph has become a king. Thus, 'Uthmān's version of the Joseph-story ties together once again the roles of kingship and prophecy (*al-mulk wa-l-nubuwwa*) which God granted to the sons of Shem at the beginning of the 'Uthmān-account.⁶²

2. The origins of Asad's *qīṣaṣ*

Therefore we see that 'Uthmān's account, based on the earlier teachings of his fellow-Egyptian predecessors Ibn Lahī'a and 'Abd Allāh b. Khālīd, has picked out specific elements of the standard biblical narrative in order to construct Joseph's rule in Egypt as an instantiation of the paradigm of fused prophetic and kingly authority established at its beginning. This stress on the link between prophesy and worldly authority, like the

⁶¹ C.f. Q 12:54-5.

⁶² FM 7, ll. 17-18. This conceptual basis of 'Uthmān's account may be considered closer to the Koran, in which Joseph proclaims that God has given him kingship, *ātaytanī mina -l-mulki*, Q 12:101.

‘Uthmān-account’s stress on the tyranny of pre-Islamic Egyptian rulers, seems again designed to legitimate Muslim rule in Egypt, this time on the basis of their inheritance of their prophet’s twin gifts of revelation and political rule. The biblical heritage has been loosely received and excerpted to fit a political argument suitable for the writing of a specifically Islamic Egyptian history.

In contrast, Asad’s account seems to be the result of a more wholesale Muslim engagement with Judaeo-Christian prophetic stories. We may observe from the *isnāds* that this engagement was not an Egyptian but an Iraqi scholarly project, whose results were imported to Egypt. Asad’s main informant was one Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh, an obscure figure about whom the Arabic biographical tradition is unusually silent.⁶³ Khālīd’s main source of information, however, was the great Kūfan scholar Muḥammad b. al-Sā’ib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), supposed by al-Dhahabī to have written the largest ever work of Qur’ānic exegesis.⁶⁴ This body of material survives only in quoted fragments, which Andrew Rippin has characterised as ‘haggadic’ in nature: this accords with the material ascribed to him in FM.⁶⁵ Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh’s other informants are as obscure as he, though it is notable that his *isnāds* go back to non-Egyptians such as Ka‘b b. Aḥbār, ‘Ikrima, and Ibn ‘Abbās. This

⁶³ Over half of Asad’s reports (16/28) he received from Khālīd. The information for these, and the following analysis of Asad’s informants, derives again from the table in the appendix.

⁶⁴ EI2, ‘al-Kalbī’. Al-Kalbī’s is Khālīd’s informant in 9/16 cases. The al-Kalbī material appears to have been the basic narrative of *qīṣaṣ* material which Khālīd and then Asad were working from and supplementing, as demonstrated by the statement at one point that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam ‘returned’ to the *ḥadīth* of < Asad b. Mūsā – Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh – al-Kalbī – Abū Ṣāliḥ – Ibn ‘Abbās > . See FM 23, l. 11.

⁶⁵ For issues surrounding the supposed al-Kalbī’s purported *Tafsīr* of Ibn ‘Abbās, see Andrew Rippin, ‘*Tafsīr* Ibn ‘Abbās and criteria for dating early *tafsīr* texts’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 18 (1994), pp. 38-83.

suggests that Khālīd was not operating in an Egyptian milieu, where one might expect such stories to be ascribed to companions with links to Egypt, such as Ibn ʿAmr or ʿUqba b. ʿĀmir. We may therefore characterise the information which Asad received from Khālīd as al-Kalbī's teachings on the prophets, supplemented by Khālīd with information of a similar nature which was also of non-Egyptian origin, suggesting that Khālīd was operating in the *mashriq*, plausibly al-Kūfa, where al-Kalbī was based. Aside from Khālīd b. ʿAbd Allāh, Asad's only other regular informant was Isrāʾīl b. Yūnus b. Abī Ishāq (d. 162/778-9), another Kūfan who presents four reports taught to him by his grandfather, also from al-Kūfa, attributed to companions of Muḥammad.⁶⁶ Asad's one-off informants were people scattered around the Islamic east, including one more Kūfan,⁶⁷ a Medinan,⁶⁸ two Baṣrans,⁶⁹ and a Ḥimṣī.⁷⁰ Only two of his *isnāds* give Egyptians as the source of his information.⁷¹

Given all this, we can say that Asad b. Mūsā's teaching on the ancient prophets made extensive use of al-Kalbī's haggadic teaching, mediated through and expanded upon by Khālīd b. ʿAbd Allāh. Asad supplemented this with material he had gathered from another Kūfan, Isrāʾīl b. Yūnus, and various other figures from the central Islamic lands. He may have encountered these on his travels, a *ṭalab al-ʿilm*, or at some central node such as al-Kūfa,

⁶⁶ For Isrāʾīl, see TI 4/307, where we learn he related from his grandfather Abū Ishāq, who is always his informant in FM. For Abū Ishāq himself, SAN 5/392-402, TI 3/473-6.

⁶⁷ Al-Masʿūdī, FM 23; TI 4/118.

⁶⁸ Ibrāhīm b. Saʿd, FM 44; TI 4/796-8.

⁶⁹ Al-Ḥasan b. Bilāl and probably the Abū ʿUlayy who, like al-Ḥasan b. Bilāl, taught the student Ḥammād b. Salam, therefore suggesting they might have shared Asad b. Mūsā as a student, FM 25; TI 4/342-6, 5/295.

⁷⁰ Ismāʿīl b. ʿAyyāsh, FM, 43; TI, 4/809-13.

⁷¹ One apiece for al-Layth and Ibn Lahīʿa, FM 13.

the presumed base of Khālid b. ‘Abd Allāh’s activity, or al-Madīna, where the *ḥajj* facilitated the coming-together of scholars from different regions. In any case, in contrast to much of the information in *FM*, Asad’s material is not presented as the intellectual heritage of Egyptian scholars, but rather as having its origins in the Mashriq.

The non-Egyptian origins of Asad’s material may be contrasted with that of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ. ‘Uthmān never transmits from a non-Egyptian in the 121 times he is cited throughout *FM*, and in al-Mizzī’s list of his teachers we only find two non-Egyptians, one from Mecca and one from Medina, suggesting a pilgrimage or encounters with travellers in Egypt, rather than any period of study abroad.⁷² Asad’s birth in al-Baṣra, as well as his participation in the elite, if now rather precarious, networks of his Umayyad family can probably explain his wider network of contacts.

The contrast is not just between these two scholars though. *FM*’s pre-Islamic section contains some sixteen traditions which could be considered either exegetical or *qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*, and which were not part of the ‘Uthmān-account or Asad’s teaching. Only one of these has an *isnād* which appears to have originated with an Egyptian scholar, which is an identification of the Pharaoh of Moses as an Arab of the Balī tribe. This is plausibly a smear intended to denigrate the tribe of Balī by associating it with the tyrant Pharaoh, however,

⁷² TKIR 19/391-3. The two are Mālik b. Anas, the jurist of Medina, and Muslim b. Khālid al-Zanjī, from Mecca, see TI 4/742.

rather than a genuine piece of exegesis.⁷³ Otherwise we find four traditions from al-Kūfa,⁷⁴ three from al-Baṣra⁷⁵ and the Ḥijāz each,⁷⁶ two from the Levant,⁷⁷ and one from the Yemen.⁷⁸ Even discounting the apparently non-Egyptian origins of these traditions, only four of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s direct informants for them were Egyptians, suggesting that this kind of information had a limited circulation in Egypt even in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time.⁷⁹ Given that we have no evidence that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam ever left Egypt, it seems likely that he

⁷³ FM 19, l. 16. Even this identification is uncertain, on the basis that ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Fāṭima was probably the grandfather of the Muḥammad b. Salama b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Fāṭima listed at TKAR 25/287, and was therefore of the Murād tribe, and so could plausibly be the ‘Abd Allāh b. Kulayb al-Murādī listed at TI 4/1141, who – assuming his father was also known by the *kunya* Abū Fāṭima – has the right *ism*, *nisba*, date, and transmits to the right circle of people, even if he wasn’t known to have transmitted to exactly the right person for this particular *isnād*.

⁷⁴ 1) FM 18, l. 18 and p. 21, l. 5, the earliest two links Abū al-Aḥwāṣ (d. 179) and Simāk b. Ḥarb (d. 123) were Kūfans, TI 3/428, 4/770.

2) FM 20, l. 2: the earliest two links after Abū Bakr, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maysara (d. 110s) and al-Nazzāl b. Sabra (d. 70s) were Kūfans, TI 2/885, 18/421.

3) FM 24, l. 15: originating with Muḥammad b. Ka’b al-Quraṣī (d. between 108 and 129), a Kūfan, TI 3/160.

4) FM 26, l. 9: the earliest two links, Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya (d. 173-4) and Abū Ishāq (d. 127-8) were Kūfans, TI 3/473-6, 4/622.

⁷⁵ 1) FM 19, l. 2, originating with al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, transmitted via the Baṣrans al-‘Abbās b. Ṭālib (d. after 216) and ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Ziyād (d. 176-7), TI 4/685-6, 5/337.

2) FM 24, l. 18, also from al-Ḥasan, transmitted by the Baṣrans Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba (d. 156) and Qatāda (d. 117-8), TI 3/301, 4/61.

3) FM 40, l. 4, from al-Ḥasan, transmitted by the Baṣrans Khāzim b. Ḥusayn (d. 160s) and Yūnus b. ‘Ubayd (d. 139) TI 3/760, 4/550-1, TKAR 8/24-6.

⁷⁶ 1) FM 24, l. 16: apparently from the Meccan Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. 100-104), EI2 ‘Mudjāhid b. Djabr’. Transmitted from him by the Meccan ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Najīḥ (d. 131), TI 3/683.

2) FM 24, l. 19: from the Medinan ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd b. Aslam (d. 182), TI 4/904-5.

3) FM 40, l. 9: originating with the Medinan al-Zuhrī (d. 124), EI2 ‘al-Zuhrī’.

⁷⁷ 1) FM 40, l. 7: originating with the Palestinian ‘Ubayd b. Ti‘lā, TKAR 19/190-1.

2) FM 44, l. 7: transmitted by two Ḥimṣīs, Mu‘āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ (d. 158) and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalḥa (d. 140s, al-Jazari but settled in Ḥimṣ) on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās, TI 3/932, 4/219-20.

⁷⁸ FM 29, l. 14: supposedly originating with ‘Ikrima (Meccan, d. 105, EI2, ‘Ikrima’), but transmitted by two Yemenis, Ḥaṣḥ b. ‘Umar (d. 210s) and al-Ḥakam b. Abān (d. 154-5), TKIR 7/86-8, TI 5/302.

⁷⁹ FM 19, l. 16; FM 42, l. 15; FM 40, l. 7; FM 44, l. 10.

picked up these scattered reports from travellers or migrants who settled in Egypt from elsewhere.⁸⁰

This strongly suggests that the Egyptian scholarly community had not developed a tradition of haggadic Koranic exegesis, nor had it developed a knowledge of non-Koranic biblical events backed up by the authorising standards of *isnād* and *matn*. ‘Uthmān’s Egyptian teachers knew non-Koranic stories of biblical prophets well enough to include details such as Pharaoh giving Joseph his seal-ring, derived from Genesis, in their pre-Islamic history. But they had not developed an epistemological strategy for translating these Judaeo-Christian narratives into naturalised Islamic knowledge. In Iraq, by contrast, exegetes such as al-Kalbī recounted these stories as formal texts ascribed to companions of the prophet. The conclusion is not necessarily that Egyptian Muslims were more insulated from Judaeo-Christian scholarly tradition than their Iraqi counterparts. Al-Kūfa was indeed founded adjacent to the Lakhmid centre of al-Ḥīra, with its Miaphysite bishopric, and within a parasang of the Jewish settlement of Sura, which housed one of the main yeshivas involved in the production of the Babylonian Talmud. However, al-Fuṣṭāṭ was also founded adjacent to a late antique Christian centre, and there would have been no shortage of Jewish scholarship in Alexandria.⁸¹ It is possible that there was more inter-religious contact in Iraq, but all we can conclude is that Iraqi Muslims had developed an intellectual means

⁸⁰ His direct informants are migrants in at least three cases: FM 19, l. 2, from a Baṣran migrant to Egypt, TI 5/337; FM 26, l. 9, from a Ḥarrānī migrant, TI 5/645; FM 43, l. 9, from a Baghdādī migrant, TI 6/180.

⁸¹ M. Gīl, *Jews in Islamic countries in the middle ages* (Leiden, 2004), p. 507 for Sura. Kubiak notes that there were ‘many monasteries in the open country around Babylon’, *al-Fustat*, p. 56.

for a more porous interaction with the knowledge of neighbouring non-Islamic religious communities. Egyptian scholars, on the other hand, had either not found or accepted these means. Therefore, when Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam wanted formal accounts of stories-of-prophets with which to elaborate the ‘Uthmān-account’s chronicle-like entries on the prophets’ activities in Egypt, he had to turn to teachers who came from or studied in the Mashriq.

3. Historical supplements to ‘Uthmān’s skeleton

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam supplemented the ‘Uthmān-account’s bare narrative not only with eastern information about the prophets, but also about the final Roman-Persian war.⁸² ‘Uthmān’s account gives a very condensed story of the alternating Roman and Persian domination of Egypt, a theme which clearly fits into his schema of the divinely-granted possession of kingship (*mulk*) by the Romans, Persians, and Arabs, and the contrary submissiveness (*hum adhillā*) of the Egyptians. Indeed, coming at the end of the ‘Uthmān-account’s pre-Islamic Egyptian history, which had begun with the origin story of those contrasting statuses, it rather seems like the penultimate act in a storyline of ‘prediction and realisation’ to be fulfilled with the rule of the Arabs.⁸³ It is this account also which is the source of the idea that the Egyptians had a *ṣulḥ* with the Romans by which they were under their *dhimma* in exchange for an annual payment:

⁸² FM 33-4.

⁸³ ‘Prediction and realisation’ being a fundamental storyline, see, for example, J. Culler, *Literary theory: A very short introduction*, p. 85 and associated bibliography.

The people of Egypt made peace with the Romans (*ṣālahū -l-Rūm*) on the condition that [the Egyptians] pay them a specified sum each year, in return for which [the Romans] would defend them and they would be under their protection (*dhimma*).⁸⁴

It thus portrays the situation of the Egyptians under the Roman empire using exactly the terms used to describe the submission of non-Muslims to the conquering Muslims, both arguing against Egyptian nostalgia for its place in the Roman empire and further identifying the *mulk* of the Romans and Arabs. It thereby affirms the Arabs' place in a succession of dominant races. There are no named actors in 'Uthmān's account of the Roman and Persian conquests, not even Heraclius and Khusrau; the narrative seems entirely concerned with outlining in a schematic nature the contestation of different groups, defined in ethnic terms, over control of Egypt. These unadorned events are synchronised in relation to the lifetime of Muḥammad: 'This happened in the age of the Messenger of God Ṣ'.⁸⁵

However, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was not content to simply recount this skeletal account. Instead, he follows the story with two long anecdotes about the Roman-Persian war which are authorised by *isnāds* leading in different ways to the citation < al-Zuhrī - 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Utba - Ibn 'Abbās > . Al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) was a Medinan who enjoyed (and suffered criticism for) close links to the ruling house of the Umayyad dynasty, famed as one

⁸⁴ FM 33, l. 21 – 34, l. 1.

⁸⁵ FM 34, ll. 7-8.

of the founders of both Islamic legal science and historical writing.⁸⁶ We find excerpts closely paralleling these passages from FM in the *History of the city of Damascus* by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1175) and the *Knowledge and history* of al-Fasawī (d. 277/890-1).⁸⁷ In both of these books, the parallel passages are ascribed through different lines of transmission to get back al-Zuhrī, with the earlier part of the *isnād* exactly as we find it in FM. This suggests that al-Zuhrī did in fact teach these accounts in the first half of the second/eighth century in a form close to that which we find in FM. However, the *isnāds* do not indicate that al-Zuhrī’s historical teachings were transmitted as authoritative packages. Al-Zuhrī is cited twenty-three times in FM, but through different *isnāds* rather than a single line of transmission. Even if the Umayyads had forced him to dictate his teachings to be written down, they were not circulated as a united body of information as the *Sīra* of Ibn Ishāq would be a generation later.⁸⁸

Al-Zuhrī’s historical narrations in FM are characteristically extended, flowing narratives centred on a particular event or theme, rather than bitty *ḥadīth*-snippets. Here, the first al-

⁸⁶ About whom much has been said; the bibliography in EI2, ‘al-Zuhrī’ is a good place to start. See also, M. Lecker, ‘Biographical Notes on Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī,’ *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 41/1 (1996), pp. 21-63.

⁸⁷ Cf. FM 34, ll. 9-19 with TMD 1/378-9, and FM 35, l. 5 - 37, l. 11 with MT 3/301-4 and TMD 1/374-7. The reproductions are not verbatim, but follow the same progression of events and ideas while displaying common use of key vocabulary, just as we observe in different *riwāyas* to Ibn Ishāq, if a little looser.

⁸⁸ There are a couple of repeated chains of transmission which could indicate packaged bodies of information however, see < ‘Abd Allāh b. Šāliḥ - al-Layth b. Sa‘d - ‘Uqayl b. Khālīd - al-Zuhrī > at pp. 34 (twice), 272; < ‘Abd Allāh b. Šāliḥ - al-Hiql b. Ziyād - Mu‘āwiya b. Yaḥyā al-Šadafi - al-Zuhrī > at pp. 35, 105; and < ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama - Ibn Wahb - Yūnus b. Yazīd - Ibn Shihāb > at pp. 45, 47, 92, 153. A cursory look into the *isnāds* involving al-Zuhrī in TMD suggest a similar conclusion, of small non-comprehensive packages, though a study of how historical information was transmitted from this influential and early figure might prove interesting (and might prove me wrong).

Zuhri-extract glosses ‘Uthmān’s account by providing an occasion of revelation for the Koran’s *Chapter of the Romans* (Q 30). Quraysh crow to the early Muslims in Mecca that they will vanquish them and their scripture just as the Zoroastrian Persians have vanquished the Romans and theirs, prompting the Koran’s message that the Persians would suffer a total reversal. The second extract gives a mundane explanation for the Persian defeat, in the story that Khusrau grew suspicious of his victorious general Shahrbarāz and tried to have him killed, prompting Shahrbarāz to make a deal with Heraclius, rebel, and oust Khusrau. Both stories add some much-lacking human interest and drama to ‘Uthmān’s account, even a touch of humour.⁸⁹ Again, we note that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did not supplement ‘Uthmān’s bare history with a different Egyptian historical account. This suggests that to tell the history of Rome and Persia in more depth, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had to access scholarly traditions from beyond Egypt; here, the historical-writing tradition developed around the Umayyad court.

4. Proving ‘Uthmān’s pre-Islamic history: The function of the ‘parallel narrations’

To sum up, while Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam adopted the pre-Islamic historical framework which he inherited from the teachings of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd, as formalised by their students Khālīd b. Najīḥ, ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ, and Yaḥyā b. Khālīd (the ‘‘Uthmān-account’), he was not content to simply relay their scant narration of ancient events and move on to the history of the conquest of Egypt. Rather, he used information which originated from

⁸⁹ I am particularly taken by the notion that Abū Bakr’s response to the revelation of *Sūrat al-Rūm* was to place a bet on the Romans beating the Persians, this being before *qimār* was forbidden. FM 34, ll. 16-18.

beyond Egypt to provide ‘parallel narrations’ of these events which filled out ‘Uthmān’s story. This material was primarily made up of exegetical ‘stories-of-prophets’ which he learned from Asad b. Mūsā. Asad was in turn reliant on an Iraqi tradition of scholarship which presented information derived ultimately from the Torah and Judaeo-Christian exegesis and apocrypha as naturalized Muslim knowledge taught by particular companions of Muḥammad. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam also supplemented the ‘Uthmān account with other snippets of exegetical material from the *mashriq* which he learned here and there from scholars who had come from the central Islamic lands, and with some historical material from al-Zuhri, which had become formally constituted Muslim knowledge not in the scholarly circles of Iraq but at the Umayyad court in Syria. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam selected these accounts because they gave fuller accounts of events mentioned briefly in the ‘Uthmān-account. He does not appear to have chosen them to develop a particular literary or political theme, or to support the overarching messages of the ‘Uthmān account. For example, he does not alter the terms used by Asad’s accounts to describe Joseph’s authority in Egypt to match the *mulk* which is presented in the ‘Uthmān-account. We can see this more clearly in the al-Zuhri quotations. A comparison with the versions of these passages found in other sources shows that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had not altered his supplementary source-material to better fit his main narrative account. His supplements do not contradict this main account, but neither do they develop it in a consistent manner.

This is doubtless to do with Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s traditionist textual conservatism; the jigsaw pieces of history were established and had to be brought together, not redrawn. The

conclusion we must draw is that the traditionist-historical mode of authorship allowed for limited control of motif.⁹⁰ The generators of the ‘Uthmān-account in the second/eighth century, organising history through a king-list and effectively narrating the story on their own authority, could tell a lean but consistent tale of the exercise of kingship (*mulk*), prophesy (*nubuwwa*), and impious tyranny (*ṭughyān*) in Egypt from Noah to the last Roman-Persian war. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, having opted for the *isnād* and the *khbar* as his building blocks, could not avoid themes and ideas within his micro-accounts of the prophets, which had originally served different narrative purposes to his own. Thus, he introduced fragments of meaning from the Iraqi stories-of-prophets which served no particular role within FM’s narrative of Egypt. In turn, as these *qīṣaṣ*-stories were relocated in FM they were denuded of their own original macro-emplotted in continuous histories of prophethood, or exegesis of scripture.

So why did Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam dilute the message of his backbone narrative of pre-Islamic Egyptian history, the ‘Uthmān-account? The answer may be to do with telling a more compelling story. A blank king-list is boring and, furthermore, might not be considered particularly impressive knowledge about the past. By introducing these stories Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam added colour, detail, and drama. Furthermore, they helped to control the pace of his story. If we removed the supplements to the ‘Uthmān-account, we would simply barrel through the king list and related notices in a couple of pages, before reaching the curiously extended ‘consequences-of-Exodus’ story. The prophetic notices provide a more measured

⁹⁰ As noted by Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography*, p. 5.

narrative speed. However, the episodic appearances of the prophets, hovering into view as they cross the Sinai and receding again as they return, the rest of their stories untold, are a little dissatisfying from a story-telling perspective. Even as these accounts include Egypt in prophetic history they remind the reader that the real action was mostly happening elsewhere, implicitly accepting the peripheral status of Egypt in the grander scheme. Thus, the explanation of narrative satisfaction is insufficient. After all, rather than importing Iraqi stories-of-prophets, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam could have systematically elaborated the ‘Uthmān-account with dramatic, entertaining, and edifying tales of wisdom and fate derived from folklore or other story-telling traditions, keeping Egypt at centre-stage. Indeed, at one point he does just this, with a tale of a tyrannous king deposed through a ruse devised by a humble potter.⁹¹ This type of narration could have been used to present Egyptian history as a source of paradigmatic political or moral wisdom, just as Persian history would be presented by its historians. But FM has precious little of this material.

Rather, I propose that the key to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s supplement of ‘Uthmān’s accounts with the material from Asad b. Mūsā and others is that they provided an appropriate epistemological framework for Muslim knowledge of these events. Asad almost always traces his narratives back to companions of Muḥammad.⁹² Therefore, he claims that the stories of the prophets which he relates were known and approved by Muḥammad and his

⁹¹ FM 29-30.

⁹² Most frequently Ibn ‘Abbās, but also Abū ‘Ubayda, ‘Amr b. Maymūn, and others. He also relates traditions back to Ka‘b b. Aḥbār. For the *isnāds*, see appendix.

companions in the golden age of Islam.⁹³ Likewise, al-Zuhri's association of the last Roman-Persian war with Q:30 makes it an incontrovertible part of Muslim knowledge, and his narration of Khusrau and Shahrbarāz comes from an *isnād*-authenticated exchange between ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and a Persian noble involved in the conflict. Thus, the exact content of these supplementary narratives was not of primary importance to Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, rather it was the fact that they were accredited within the epistemological framework of the *ḥadīth*-folk. Though the ʿUthmān-account provided a comprehensive and, for Muslims, compelling vision of Egyptian history, the fact that in the second/eighth century Ibn Lahīʿa had said it had happened was not a convincing enough truth-claim for Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam in the third/ninth century. In contrast, Ibn ʿAbbās' relation of these events in the first/seventh century was. Therefore, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam introduced these accounts which narrated the same events mentioned by the ʿUthmān-account not to develop motifs or tell a different kind of story, but as proofs of the events described in the ʿUthmān-account, which still provided the narrative structure through which he wanted to make those events meaningful.

Supplementing ʿUthmān II: Adding to the story

In certain cases, however, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam did include accounts in FM's pre-Islamic section which added events not reported by the ʿUthmān account. Thus, they cannot be

⁹³ For the epistemological framework of Islamic historians, see Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, pp. 83-102.

explained as mere proofs of the events in the ‘Uthmān-account, and we may read them as signalling particular messages which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam thought important, which the ‘Uthmān-account lacked. These include two stories about Joseph and a story surrounding Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion of Egypt, all unmentioned in the ‘Uthmān-account.

1. Joseph and the canals

The first of these stories is that of Joseph’s construction of the canals which bring water to irrigate the Fayyūm, in response to a test invented by Pharaoh’s advisors in an attempt to depose him. This is told in the aftermath of Joseph’s elevation to rule in Egypt and the overcoming of the famine.⁹⁴ A brief version of the story is presented on the authority of < Yaḥyā b. Khālīd al-‘Adawī – Ibn Lahī‘a – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb >.⁹⁵ Yaḥyā is the ‘other person’ (*ghayruhu*) given alongside ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ in the *riwāya* to the main king-list account of Egypt, ascribed to Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd. This brief version then may in fact have been a part of Ibn Lahī‘a’s teachings which ‘Uthmān and his colleagues had edited into a formal narrative of Egyptian pre-Islamic history. As ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ is not cited, this must have been a section that ‘Uthmān left out but Yaḥyā included. It is notable that this account shares the ‘Uthmān-account’s interest in *nubuwwa* and *mulk*. The account begins *anna Yūsuf al-nabiyya ṣ malaka Miṣr*, ‘Joseph the prophet ruled Egypt’, and the deposed Joseph is told that if he makes the Egyptian desert fertile he will be ‘returned to his rule/kingship’ (*radadnāka ilā mulkika*). This is indeed what happens, the term *mulk* being

⁹⁴ FM 14-6.

⁹⁵ FM 15, l. 15 – 16, l. 4.

used again in the conclusion of the story. This supports the notion that Yaḥyā and ʿUthmān were transmitting an account from Ibn Lahīʿa which sustained a consistency of motif. This brief version of the Joseph-and-the-canals story thus shows us Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam including stories taught by Ibn Lahīʿa as part of his pre-Islamic Egyptian history which ʿUthmān had discarded.

Just as Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam supplemented the ʿUthmān-account's terse narration with longer Iraqi stories-of-prophets, here he supplements the Yaḥyā-account with a fuller, more dramatic account, though this one is from Egypt. It is this narration which explicitly presents the invention of the complex system of Egyptian irrigation as a blessing brought by Joseph 'from the kingdom of heaven', and therefore an inheritance from prophetic intervention rather than an alien, non-Islamic civilisation, as considered earlier in the thesis.⁹⁶ The point to be added is that the extended narrative on this topic is all presented on the authority of a little-known Egyptian scholar Hishām b. Ishāq (d. 235/849-50), remembered in the biographical literature for having studied with Mālik b. Anas and al-Layth b. Sa'd and being 'well versed in the accounts of Egypt', but for little else.⁹⁷ Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam dubs the information on this topic the '*ḥadīth* of Hishām b. Ishāq' and at times introduces material from other sources before 'returning to the account of Hishām b. Ishāq'.⁹⁸ He is clearly drawing on a coherent, extended account. However, Hishām's authorities are not named in the *isnād*, demonstrating that this story, unlike those related

⁹⁶ See the analysis in Chapter Three, above, pp. 86-91.

⁹⁷ TI 5/958.

⁹⁸ FM 14, l. 16; 16, l. 5; 17, l. 11.

by Asad b. Mūsā, is not here to bolster the epistemological basis of Islamic knowledge of ancient Egypt. Rather, here Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chose to add an account which stressed the prophetic origin of the agricultural sciences and landscape of Egypt. Thus, he gave a sacred gloss to the politics-focussed message of his main account, outlining the benefits to Egypt of rule by those truly possessed of *mulk* and *nubuwwa*. Hishām’s *ḥadīth* is also invoked to provide another prophetic episode not mentioned in the ‘Uthmān-account, the coming of Jacob to Egypt. Hishām provides a dramatic narration of Jacob’s interview with Pharaoh in the course of which we learn that the images in the ancient temples of Egypt were of the Israelites who would bring Pharaoh’s kingdom to ruin.⁹⁹ It is notable that these stories of Joseph and the canals come from Egyptian rather than Iraqi informants, and have no parallel in the biblical account of Joseph. This again shows Egyptian Muslim scholars creatively engaging with the history of the prophets in Egypt, rather than presiding over the more faithful translation of Judeo-Christian narratives into the Arabic tradition we see in Asad’s Iraqi traditions.¹⁰⁰

It should be noted that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s other information about the origins of Egyptian agriculture, related by the main transmitters of the ‘Uthmān-account though seemingly not part of it, ascribe Egypt’s canals to the Pharaoh of Moses and his commander Hāmān.¹⁰¹ This is explained as the meaning of the Koranic speech in which Pharaoh says to his people, ‘O

⁹⁹ FM 17.

¹⁰⁰ It is, of course, possible that these were apocryphal stories transmitted into the Arabic tradition which I have either not yet found, or which are no longer extant in their non-Arabic versions.

¹⁰¹ FM 6–7.

my people, do I not possess the kingdom of Egypt, and these rivers flowing beneath me?’¹⁰²

Thus, this earlier Egyptian Muslim tradition derived its knowledge about the ancient past from a creative engagement with the Koran, rather than Judaeo-Christian texts. Furthermore, this earlier tradition did not seek to present Egypt’s infrastructure as an inheritance from the prophets, but as Pharaoh’s doing. Therefore we see that Hishām b. Ishāq’s interpretation was an innovative one in Egypt. Joseph of course predated Pharaoh, a fact made explicit in both Hishām’s account and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s gloss on it: ‘From that day engineering was brought into existence, the people not having known of it beforehand. [Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam] said: Joseph ﷺ was the first who measured the Nile in Egypt’.¹⁰³ This seems to be a conscious attempt to refute the idea that the evil Pharaoh could have been a source of good or an exemplar for rulership, and suggests that FM’s presentation of a sacred origin for Egypt’s agricultural landscape was a project of Hishām and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s generation in the first half of the third/ninth century, rather than of Ibn Lahī‘a and his compatriots in the second/eighth.

Another story about Joseph also provides information lacking in the ‘Uthmān-account, this time regarding Joseph’s burial in Egypt and the eventual transferral of his bones to Syria by Moses during the Exodus. Again, we see a relatively long, coherent account on a topic related at different points of FM with the same *isnād* < Muḥammad b. As‘ad – Abū al-Aḥwaṣ -

¹⁰² Q 43:51.

¹⁰³ FM 16, ll. 16-17.

Simāk b. Ḥarb > .¹⁰⁴ This story, whose content was also analysed earlier in the thesis, tells us that whichever side of Nile Joseph was buried on became fertile while the other grew arid, until he was buried in the Nile itself and both sides became fruitful, providing a monotheistic basis for the Nile as sacred river. In contrast to the story of the Fayyūm, however, it does originate in the Iraqi stories-of-prophets. Both Abū al-Aḥwaṣ (d. 179/795-6) and Simāk b. Ḥarb (d. 123/740-1) were Kūfans, whereas Muḥammad b. Asʿad (d. 210s/c. 830) was a Meccan who settled in the Anatolian *thughūr*.¹⁰⁵ While the story cannot be found in the Torah, the theme of Joseph's bones and their transferral can be found in Jewish haggadic literature.¹⁰⁶

2. Nebuchadnezzar's invasion

The final account added to the sequence of the ʿUthmān king-list is the story of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt.¹⁰⁷ The *isnād* merely indicates Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's direct source for the story, Wathīma b. Mūsā, rather than tracing its origin back to companions of Muḥammad. Indeed, the account is immediately followed by an unrelated story that tangentially mentions the destruction wrought by Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, furnished with a full *isnād* to a companion.¹⁰⁸ Wathīma's Nebuchadnezzar story, therefore, needed its own proof-report, and thus could not have functioned as epistemological ballast for the ʿUthmān-account. Rather, it must be read as an intervention in the narrative which

¹⁰⁴ FM 18, 21-2.

¹⁰⁵ For Muḥammad, TI 5/432; Abū al-Aḥwaṣ, TI 4/770; Simāk, TI 3/428.

¹⁰⁶ J. Kugel, *In Potiphar's house: The interpretative life of biblical texts* (Boston, Mass., 1994).

¹⁰⁷ FM 31-2.

¹⁰⁸ FM 32, ll. 12-19.

was meaningful because of its content rather than paratext. The account is introduced with a report of the 'succession-news' for Egypt in the form we are familiar from the 'Uthmān-account, keeping us in the same time-frame: 'Then Luqās died and his son Qūmis b. Luqās succeeded'. Then we are introduced to Wathīma's report, which tells us that in the time of this king Nebuchadnezzar conquered the Israelites and deported them to Babylon. A remnant of Israelites remained in Jerusalem, who ask their prophet Jeremiah's counsel. He tells them to remain in their country and seek God's forgiveness. However, fearing Nebuchadnezzar's further wrath, they ignore their prophet and flee to the protection of the king of Egypt, who refuses to hand them over when Nebuchadnezzar demands it, telling him that the Israelites are a people of prophesy and scripture (*ahl al-nubuwwa wa-l-kitāb*). Jeremiah continually predicts dire consequences for their disobeying God's command and their fear of the worldly power of Nebuchadnezzar over his divine power. Jeremiah is proved correct when Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt, kills the king, and enslaves the Israelites and the Egyptians to boot. All the Egyptians are deported to Babylon whilst Egypt remains uninhabited for forty years, its blessings benefitting no-one beside Jeremiah, who tended a garden and a crop-field. After this the Egyptians are returned to the land and repopulate it, but the story concludes with the statement that from that day forth Egypt remained continually subjugated (*lam tazal Miṣr maqhūratan min yawma'idhin*).

The account clearly derives, at some remove, from the biblical account of these events found in Jeremiah 41:16-46:28, which contains a story of the Israelite rump seeking refuge in Egypt against God's will as conveyed via Jeremiah, and being punished for it with

Nebuchadnezzar's invasion and their capture, the Babylonian king being an instrument for God's wrath. The biblical account is longer, and dwells much more on moral exhortation against the Israelites' sin and practice of other religious cults.¹⁰⁹ However, many features of the accounts match closely. Early in the biblical account God tells Jeremiah, 'Ye have seen all the evil that I have brought upon Jerusalem, and upon all the cities of Judah; and, behold, this day they *are* a desolation, and no man dwelleth therein'. Later he threatens that 'Noph [i.e. Memphis, the capital of ancient Egypt] shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant'.¹¹⁰ In the Arabic we see Jerusalem described as *kharāb* and the statement that '[Nebuchadnezzar] ruined the cities and villages of Egypt, captured all its people, and did not leave a single person therein, to the extent that Egypt remained a ruin for forty years without an inhabitant (*laysa fihā sākin*)'.¹¹¹ In both accounts God tells Jeremiah to place stones at the places where Nebuchadnezzar will put the legs of his throne, as a warning to the Israelites in Egypt.¹¹² Even the notion that the Egyptians were returned to their land after forty years could be an expansion of God's telling Jeremiah that 'afterward it [Egypt] shall be inhabited, as in the days of old'.¹¹³

Of course, Jewish scripture is not given as the origin of this material. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam relates the almost two-page report on the authority of a single *isnād* citing 'Wathīma b. Mūsā and another (*ghayruhu*)'. Wathīma (d. 237/851) was a silk-trader from Persia who had

¹⁰⁹ See especially Jeremiah 44:9-10, 15-25.

¹¹⁰ Jeremiah 44:2, 46:19.

¹¹¹ FM 31, l. 4; 32, ll. 6-7.

¹¹² Jeremiah 43:9-10, FM 31, ll. 18-20; 31, l. 22-32, l. 1.

¹¹³ Jeremiah 46:26.

travelled widely (as far as Spain in the west) but ultimately settled in al-Fuṣṭāṭ. As well as his trade, he was apparently well-versed in *ḥadīths* from Muḥammad, historical accounts of early Islamic history, and stories-of-prophets. As such, we are told that he authored a book called *The Apostasy* on the wars after the death of Muḥammad, as well as *The Beginning of Creation and the Stories of the Prophets*, which was esteemed by Ibn Ḥajar as one of the finest in its field.¹¹⁴ A manuscript of the second half of the latter is extant in the Vatican, which has been edited by Raif Khoury. This manuscript is Wathīma's son's *riwāya* of his father's teaching, arranging the lives of the prophet in chronological order. In it we find essentially the same tale of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion as related from Wathīma in FM.¹¹⁵ Very close correspondences in the event progression, vocabulary, and syntax – at times almost verbatim – show that both written texts derive from a common source.¹¹⁶ However, different syntactical choices are made and the order of events is occasionally swapped around.¹¹⁷ In general, FM is more concise and fairer copy than Khoury's unicum, providing clearer readings.¹¹⁸ These divergences suggest that FM and Khoury's manuscript did not

¹¹⁴ TI 5/959, LM 8/374. A few other references are collected in EI2, 'Wathīma b. Mūsā'.

¹¹⁵ R. Khoury, *Les légendes prophétiques dans l'Islam depuis le I^{er} jusqu'au III^e siècle de l'hégire. D'après le manuscrit d'Abū Rifā'a 'Umāra b. Waṭīma, K. Bad' al-ḥalq wa-qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*. Avec éd. crit. du texte (Wiesbaden, 1978). The parallel account can be found at pp. 268-272 of the edition.

¹¹⁶ For an example of near-verbatim replication, cf. FM 31, ll. 5-8 and Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 269, ll. 1-8.

¹¹⁷ See God's revelation to Jeremiah about his hypothetical grant of an escape route even were the sky and earth crashing together migrating from before the report of the Israelites arrival in Egypt in Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 270, ll. 1-2, to after their arrival in FM 31, ll. 15-16.

¹¹⁸ At times Khoury's ms. is longer but seemingly garbled, see Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 269, ll.8-12, cf. the more concise and legible FM 31, ll. 8-9. Note that FM subsequently omits the interesting idea of the Israelites that God's protection is not going to help them much given how angry God clearly is with them, Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 269, ll. 12-14. See also, Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 271, l. 8-11, when Jeremiah's response to Nebuchadnezzar's question is omitted (a garbled version of it seems to have migrated to an earlier point in the account, see ll. 3-4) and what clearly should be Nebuchadnezzar's speech is ascribed to Jeremiah, as it is in FM 32, ll. 4-6.

derive from the same written exemplar. Rather, it seems likely that FM's account was a record of Wathīma's orally delivered lectures. Khoury's manuscript, attributed to Wathīma's son, may be an attempt to fix his father's teachings in written form, perhaps derived from his father's lecture notes or simply his knowledge of his father's teachings.

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam appears also to have edited out references in Wathīma's account which were irrelevant to his purposes. These include the implications of the story for dietary law, a reference calling back to earlier events which led to the destruction of Jerusalem, and God's promise to Jeremiah that he 'will return the Israelites to the holy land another time, help them against their enemies, and see how they do', priming the next part of the continuous narrative of the prophets and the Israelites.¹¹⁹ Thus Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam has removed references which obviously situate the story within another narrative frame.

Not only this, he also embellished the account. Where Khoury's manuscript always refers to the Egyptian king simply as *malik Miṣr*, in FM this becomes Qūmis, the name of the ruler given in the king-list entry immediately preceding Wathīma's account.¹²⁰ It would be surprising if Wathīma's account, clearly based on para-biblical materials, included the invented king name we find in FM's king-list. It seems that here Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam has altered his source text to match the nomenclature of his king-list, though as noted earlier

¹¹⁹ Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 268, l. 19–p. 269, l. 1 for not eating swifts; p. 269, ll. 3–4, integrating the coming disobedience of the Israelites with an earlier disobedience; p. 271, ll. 15–6, returning to Israelites. To see where these were omitted, cf. FM 31, l. 4; p. 31, ll. 5–6; p. 32, l. 10.

¹²⁰ FM 31, ll. 2, 10, 12, 20, 21.

he does not do this elsewhere.¹²¹ As noted, there is no explicit reference to Nebuchadnezzar's invasion in FM's citations of the 'Uthmān-account, which suggests that it did not have an entry on this episode. It seems probable that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam therefore interpolated one of the names from the 'Uthmān-account to Wathīma's account in order to integrate the Nebuchadnezzar story into his historical frame. Alternatively, it is possible that there was a reference to the Nebuchadnezzar episode in the 'Uthmān-account which associated it with the ruler Qūmis and that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam amalgamated this account with Wathīma's account for some reason. In this reading, the additions of content found in FM's version of the Nebuchadnezzar-story would reflect elements of a basic version originally present in the 'Uthmān-account. This might explain why he attributes the story to 'Wathīma and another' rather than just Wathīma. However, I favour the first scenario because on the other occasions when Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam had both a brief notice from the 'Uthmān-account and a separate account, we see him citing them separately rather than amalgamating them. The point cannot be conclusively proven however.

Aside from adding a name which integrates Wathīma's story into the 'Uthmān-account's historical framework, other deviations in the FM-version of the story add an Egyptian focus to events, notably introducing the Egyptian people as a character. The first major deviation of this sort is in the account of the conquest itself, as seen below:

¹²¹ Elsewhere, accounts embellishing 'Uthmān-account just refer to the ruler as *al-malik* or *Fir'awn*, e.g. FM 10, l. 4, where the name of the ruler who gave Hagar to Sarah is given in the 'Uthmān-account, but the stories embellishing the 'Uthmān-account simply call him the *malik*, e.g. FM 10, ll. 10, 13 etc. See the earlier discussion above, pp. 157-8.

Khoury, <i>Légendes</i> , p. 271, ll. 1-3.	FM 31, l. 20- 32, l. 1.
Nebuchadnezzar went forth to Egypt and captured its king. His soldiers went forth and he divided the booty (<i>fay'</i>) and wished to kill the first-born (? <i>amhār</i>). He placed his throne in that place [referring back to the location Jeremiah had described, mentioned immediately before in the narrative].	Nebuchadnezzar marched against Qūmis b. Luqās, the king of Egypt, and fought him for a year. Then Nebuchadnezzar was victorious. He killed Qūmis and captured all of the Egyptian people, killing some. When he wanted to kill someone whom he had captured he put down his throne on him in the place which Jeremiah had described.

FM's concern for the implications of the invasion for Egypt and its people, totally absent from Wathīma's account which is entirely focussed on the Israelites, continues in two further passages which diverge substantially. Both accounts include an interview between Nebuchadnezzar and Jeremiah after the conquest. At its conclusion, Wathīma simply tells us that 'he [Nebuchadnezzar] killed them [the Israelites]'. FM, by contrast, reads:

[Nebuchadnezzar] laid waste to the cities and villages of Egypt and captured all its people, not leaving anyone therein to the point that Egypt remained for forty years in ruins, without a single inhabitant there, the Nile flooding and receding without profiting anyone.¹²²

Again, at the conclusion of the narrative, FM adds a passage totally unrelated to that found in Khoury's manuscript:

Then it was that Nebuchadnezzar returned the Egyptians to Egypt after forty years. They dwelled there but Egypt remained subjugated from that day forth.¹²³

¹²² Khoury, *Légendes*, p. 271, l. 11; FM 32, ll. 6-8.

¹²³ FM 32, ll. 11-12. Cf. its absence in the corresponding section, Khoury, *Légendes*, pp. 271, l. 17 – 272, l. 1.

There is no good reason to suppose that Wathīma's son redacted these passages from his father's account. It seems far more probable that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam introduced these passages to make Wathīma's story fit the history he was constructing, based on the 'Uthmān-account, which featured the Egyptian people as a central character and its landscape as a major concern. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam altered the account to offer another example of his paradigm of Egyptian rulers being humbled and the Egyptian population being rendered subservient in moments when they stood on the wrong side of prophetic history. It is ironic that here, in contrast to the Exodus episode, the Egyptians fall foul of God by trying to protect rather than persecute the Israelites. This surely underscores the point that their wretchedness is caused by being cut off from the true interpretation of God's will brought about by prophesy (*nubuwwa*), here figured by Jeremiah who warns the Israelites but not the Egyptians.

Yet this passage offers more than another example of a timeless paradigm; it develops the overarching narrative and introduces a breach with previous continuity in the statement that 'Egypt remained subjugated from that day forth'. True enough, the remainder of FM's pre-Islamic history recounts the domination of Egypt by Rome and Persia and no ruler of Egypt is named henceforth. Thus, the Nebuchadnezzar incident marks the end of the story of the Copts' rule over their own land. The pathos of 'the Nile flooding and receding without profiting anyone' reminds us of the beginning of the 'Uthmān-account, in which God settled the Copts 'in the blessed land that is the mother of lands, and the succour of

humanity, whose river is the best of the world's rivers'.¹²⁴ Just as Nebuchadnezzar cut them off from the river which was their blessing, so too their rule of Egypt has now been abrogated.

This abrogation solves, rather neatly, a narrative problem. The consequences-of-Exodus story has just been concluded in the reign of Qūmis' father, with the statement that on the Egyptians' loss of the ability to repair the magical defences of Egypt, 'they became like all others except for the large size of their army and the wealth which they possessed'.¹²⁵ The next statement which we find attributed to the 'Uthmān-account is that:

Then the Romans and Persians overcame the rest of the kings who were in the centre of the land. The Romans fought the Egyptians for three years . . . the Egyptians made peace with them on conditions that they would pay them a set sum every year – in return for which [the Romans] would defend them – and would enter into their protection (*dhimma*).¹²⁶

The immediate transition from a wealthy and powerful Egypt to a dominated Egypt is rather jarring. It is possible that we are missing some of the 'Uthmān-account which explains this. But thus far the extracts make up an entirely continuous account, as shown by the contiguous king-list tracing succession from each ruler to the next, suggesting that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was using all of the 'Uthmān-account, and that this narrative lurch was inherent in this account. If we accept that the guiding plotline of 'Uthmān's account is one of prophesy and fulfilment, demonstrating the implications of Noah's curse of the Egyptians

¹²⁴ FM 8, ll. 2-3.

¹²⁵ FM 30.

¹²⁶ FM 33-4.

to be subservient (*adhillāʾ*) and the blessing of the Romans, Persians, and Arabs with kingship and prophesy, then the rule of the Romans and Persians requires no especial explanation. Nonetheless, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam seems to have indulged in a little providential overdetermination, providing with the Nebuchadnezzar-account an immediate context in which the Egyptians' inability to access and thus respond appropriately to prophetic instruction brought about their destruction.

3. Conclusion

In conclusion, these occasions where Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam augmented the ʿUthmān-account with events to which it did not refer should be read distinctly from his use of stories-of-prophets to expand ʿUthmān's brief prophetic references. Little consistency of message or motif can be found in those accounts, beyond their provision of more detailed stories of ʿUthmān's basic narrative. As such, while their content no doubt became integrated into the historical image of Egypt which FM provided, and the drama of these narratively competent units added to the appeal of FM, their content does not help us to understand Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's purposes in creating his history. Rather, a particular formal characteristic – their authentication by the *isnāds* which were the essential condition for the *ḥadīth*-folk's truth claims – determined their inclusion as proof texts. They show Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam validating the Egyptian narrative of ancient history which he had inherited from his teachers with

scholarly tools developed in the central Islamic lands.¹²⁷ The accounts we have just inspected, in contrast, tell us something different about what Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was trying to achieve. They did not simply reaffirm the account Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had to hand, but added new content which we can use to gauge what he thought was significant about pre-Islamic history, which elements of ‘Uthmān’s account needed to be stressed, and what was missing. The fact that these accounts are not supported by *isnāds* leading to Muḥammad or his companions further underscores their distinct function from the stories-of-prophets material mostly transmitted by Asad b. Mūsā.

The stories about Joseph’s canals and his burial which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduced have a common theme; the reading of Egypt’s ancient remains, agricultural basis, and natural fertility, as heritages of the prophetic past in Egypt. While the ‘Uthmān-account was interested simply in the fact that Joseph had ruled Egypt, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam wanted to show how that prophetic rule had benefitted the land. Rather than simply viewing pre-Islamic Egyptian history as a foreshadowing of the Arabs’ legitimate rule in Egypt, through their inheritance of *nubuwwa* and *mulk* from Shem and his son Arfakhshādh, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam actively engineered his history to include stories which demonstrated how the very landscape of Egypt reverberated with signs of the power and blessings of prophesy. However, we see from his inclusion of the Nebuchadnezzar account that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam remained invested in the ‘Uthmān-account’s story of *mulk* and *nubuwwa* which explained

¹²⁷ I am not claiming here that the easterners invented *isnāds*, rather that these texts which reconstitute Judaeo-Christian biblical and para-biblical narratives as Muslim knowledge through *isnāds* to companions all come from non-Egyptian sources.

the Copts' servility. Thus, he inserted a new episode in the grand narrative, that of Nebuchadnezzar. Furthermore, he subtly reshaped this story from being one about Israelite lack of faith into one which showed how the Copts' alienation from prophesy resulted in their being conquered and the ruin of Egypt.

Macro-conclusions: Composing Egyptian pre-Islamic history

Before we progress to the source-accounts of the Arab conquest which is the main subject of FM, we should consider how the insights which we have gained through looking at Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's sources and authorship in this section relate to the analysis of the function of the pre-Islamic history within the wider narrative of FM conducted earlier in this thesis.

Firstly, it is clear that while Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was reliant on pre-existing packages of information for the content and structure of certain sub-sections of his prologue to the Islamic history of Egypt, the overall arrangement was his own. No two sub-sections were reliant on the same informants, indicating that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam had not inherited a prior scheme in which these bodies of information had been collected together. The opening section of *ḥadīths* about the Copts looks to have been collected by Ibn Maslama. The *faḍāʾil* of Egypt appears to have been mainly based on information taught by Ibn Lahīʿa, but does not seem to have been transmitted as a unified package. The chronological section, as we have seen, was a much-supplemented version of the ʿUthmān-account transmitted from Ibn Lahīʿa and ʿAbd Allāh b. Khālīd. And finally, the section on Alexandria was assembled by Ibn

ʿAbd al-Ḥakam from reports taught by a diverse array of his teachers. As such, just as we can inspect Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s authorship through his micro-arrangement of narratives – the constructions of meaning wrought by his juxtaposition of individual reports – this macro-arrangement is also a valid means of understanding his intention and authorship.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam started his history in widescreen, with an image of the entire world. The first *khbar* of the book tells us that the earth is shaped in the form of a bird: the Arabian peninsula is its head; Syria and Egypt its chest; Iraq and India its two wings; and the Maghrib its tail.¹²⁸ Once Egypt is spatially located, our viewpoint zooms in and we see both the people and landscape of Egypt. We are introduced to the Copts through Muḥammad’s *ḥadīths* about them, which establish their place in the descent of man, their virtue, and their relationship to the Arabs. This introduction of the Copts is particularly important, as it establishes an ethnic label for the Egyptian people which is never used by the ʿUthmān-account or the *qīṣaṣ* of Asad with which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam will tell the story of pre-Islamic Egypt. This helps to tie together the pre-Islamic and Islamic sections of the book, by insisting on the ancient, autochthonous status in Egypt of the ‘Copts’, who will be ubiquitously considered as the subject-population of Egypt in the conquest-accounts. The *faḍāʾil* of Egypt then gives us a paradisiacal vision of riverways, canals and bridges surrounded by blooming crops from time immemorial. Once the characters have been met and the scene set, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is then able to tell the story which he has taken from

¹²⁸ FM 1.

‘Uthmān and embellished, which shows how these people and this land were ruled from the time of Noah to the Roman re-conquest in the time of Muḥammad.

At this point we have what seems to be a digression: a seven-page excursus on the ‘construction of Alexandria’. We have seen that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam devised this section himself, rather than reproducing or embellishing a pre-existing package. I believe the positioning of the section does in fact make sense when recognised as a part of this wider narrative of scene-setting. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduces the excursus with a report from ‘a *shaykh* from the people of Egypt’, a statement which I have argued is a cipher for Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial voice within a rhetorical framework which required relation rather than narration.¹²⁹ He tells us:

Heraclius, king of the Romans, dispatched al-Muqawqis as governor of Egypt. He appointed him in control of its military and the collection of taxes, and he stayed in Alexandria.¹³⁰

Thus, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduces the topic of Alexandria as the conclusion to the ‘Uthmān-account which has concluded with the Roman re-imposition of control over Egypt. As we shall see in the next chapter, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chose not to begin his account of the Arab conquest with ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ’s entry to Egypt, as his source-account did. Instead, he inserted a body of material related to Muḥammad’s supposed envoys to al-Muqawqis, which explicitly located him in Alexandria.¹³¹ Therefore, the introduction of a section of *‘ajā’ib*

¹²⁹ In the section on ‘Identifying Alexander’ in Chapter Four, above, pp. 123-6.

¹³⁰ FM 37, ll. 13-14.

¹³¹ FM 45, ll. 13, 16.

about Alexandria is yet more scene-setting, designed to smooth the transition from the ‘Uthmān-account which has never mentioned Alexandria, to the novel way in which he wanted to start his conquest account in that city. We have zoomed in yet further, from the earth to a city. Just as we envisaged the countryside of Egypt in bloom before Noah’s descendants arrived there, now we find ourselves in the blinding white marble streets of Alexandria, awaiting the entry of Ḥaṭīb b. Abī Balta‘a with a message from Muḥammad.¹³² It is to there, and to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s sources for conquest history, that we go next.

¹³² FM 42.

Chapter Eight:

Writing conquest history

Whereas the previous chapter focussed on the nature of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s backbone package of pre-Islamic history, and the ways in which he supplemented it, this chapter will perform a similar analysis of his use of his sources for ‘conquest-history’ in FM. It will include both his section on the conquest of Egypt and on that of the Maghrib. This is because both of those sections can be also shown to be built on pre-existing accounts, in like manner to the pre-Islamic history. We will see in Chapter Nine that this distinguishes these sections of the book from the other sections, which are the result of different kinds of authorial acts. Firstly, I will outline and describe the accounts, their nature, and their authorship as claimed in the *riwāyas*.¹ I will also look at how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam wove other traditions into their narrative, just as he wove Asad’s material into ‘Uthmān’s narrative of pre-Islamic history. We will see that each can be shown to be a coherent narrative in its own right, with its own distinct periodisation and narrative arc, constructed to serve distinct agendas. We continue to be interested in how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam reused these accounts, exposing his acts of authorship through introducing material which was not part of these backbone packages, and the effects that he was trying to create through these juxtapositions: both by weaving new material into pre-existing narratives, and by adding prefatory and concluding sections.² Finally, inspection

¹ Sub-section one: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s narrative sources for conquest history.

² Explored in sub-section two: Framing the *futūḥ*.

of the extent and distribution of these main packages of conquest history, along with their transmission history, will allow us to observe the extent to which the macro-arrangement of FM was dependent on configurations already established by Egyptian scholars in previous generations.³

1. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s narrative sources for conquest history

The *hadīth* of Ibn Wahb:

1. The story

‘These people will not march against anyone without conquering them until they kill the best of themselves.’⁴

This prediction by an unnamed Copt, viewing ‘Amr’s army encamped in the Delta, opens Ibn Wahb’s story. The account closes with the same Copt uttering it again to the conquering general ‘Amr, who is incensed. However, when he later hears of the murder of the caliph ‘Umar he concludes that the Copt’s prediction had come to pass. The bookended structure demonstrates that this was one interconnected narrative unit and indeed, Ibn Wahb’s account seems more of a vehicle for this prediction than an attempt to provide a functioning account of ‘Amr’s conquest of Egypt. ‘Amr’s departure from the Levant is not explained, rather we encounter him already arrived in Egypt. His route to the siege of Babylon is likewise

³ Sub-sections three, ‘‘Uthmān’s history? Layers of *ta’līf*’, and four, ‘Beyond ‘Uthmān’s *History*’.

⁴ FM 59, ll. 7-8.

obscure, with only the brief glorification of a daring overnight cavalry sortie led by a man of the Lakhm tribe. Nor does the account, if the text preserved in FM is comprehensive, discuss the subsequent campaign against Alexandria. Nevertheless, as it mentions the conquest of the fortress of Babylon and the terms imposed afterwards, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does consider it one of his perspectives (*wajhs*) on the conquest. Despite the stress on the Copt’s prediction, in its extant wording the prophecy does not seem to foretell the death of ‘Umar with which the account closes. The Copt says that Muslim expansion will continue until they themselves kill their best man, whereas ‘Umar was killed by a non-Muslim. This discrepancy allows for the introduction of an unattributed coda to the account which has ‘Amr realise that the ‘best of themselves’ was not in fact the caliph ‘Umar but ‘Uthmān, who was indeed killed by Muslims. Such an obvious error in the original account seems implausible. Rather, it seems likely that the wording of the original account was altered to allow for the introduction of an account glorifying ‘Uthmān rather than ‘Umar as the best Muslim. The polemical implications of this move and the likely suspect will be explored below.

The account is very brief, covering a mere twenty-one lines of text altogether. It was plausibly longer in the original: there must have been some frame-story for the Lakhmid cavalry-attack, which in FM is explained only by the surrounding narrative from other sources. Nevertheless, it is clearly uninterested in providing hard data – even the name of Babylon is left unsaid, being dubbed simply ‘the fortress’. Thus, knowledge of the progress of the campaign is assumed rather than given. Rather, the conquest-narrative stresses two main

points: the aforementioned glorious conduct of a Lakhmī; and above all, the encounter with a prophetic non-Muslim figure whose prediction establishes a periodisation of early Islamic history in which the death of ‘Umar marked the end of the Arabs’ uninterrupted military success.

While the account does discuss the tribute paid to the Arabs at the conclusion of hostilities, and implies that the inhabitants opened the fortress to the invaders rather than being conquered, it does not do so in terms of the juristic categories of *ṣulḥ*, *‘ahd*, *‘aqd*, or *‘anwa* that we find repeatedly in discussions of the legal implications of the conquest. This suggests that this account either predated those discussions, or was the result of different impulses for remembering the conquest. Ethnic categories are used for the non-Muslims, but not for the invading army, which is simply described by the Copts as ‘this people’ (*hā’ulā’i -l-qawm*) or by the narrative as ‘Amr and those with him’ (*‘Amr wa-man ma’ahu*).⁵ The Copts have no active role. They are presented as quasi-prophetic spectators of the battles between the Roman antagonists and the invaders, though they do claim that they see ‘nothing but good’ in what has occurred.⁶ ‘Amr is accorded no particular glory, although unlike the other accounts we will inspect he never has to relinquish the initiative to his sub-commanders.

2. Contested readings and supplements

⁵ FM 59, ll. 4, 6, 7, 19; p. 60, l. 1.

⁶ FM 60, ll. 9-10.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam presents this narrative with several glosses, which both develop and transform the account. Firstly, two comments from his father Arabise the originally blank depiction of the conquering army. Secondly, two anonymous glosses defuse the implicitly anti-Umayyad message of the Copt’s prophecy and turn it on its head.

a. Arabising the conquerors

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father’s additions expand upon the main account’s brief mention of a banquet offered to the invaders after the conquest of Babylon.⁷ In these supplements, ‘Amr orders his companions to prepare a return banquet. At this the Arabs, kneeling and wrapped Bedouin-style in crude desert garments, offer the Romans a thin broth of soggy bread and half-eaten bones, gratuitously performing their barbarism by spattering their food over the disgusted Romans sitting in their silk chairs. The original banquet is only mentioned by the Ibn Wahb account, and therefore Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father must have also taught and commented on the same account which his son learned from another teacher.⁸ His commentary on the feast aligned Ibn Wahb’s account with interpretations of the conquest which contrasted the Arabs’ rude asceticism with the Romans’ decadence.⁹ Further, by

⁷ FM 60, ll. 4-5, 15-21.

⁸ This suggests that while we have only one transmission of most of these accounts, they would probably have been known and transmitted by a wider community, and been to some extent a common property of the scholarly community.

⁹ T. Sizgorich, “‘Horsemen by day and monks by night’: Narrative and community in Islamic late antiquity”, in his *Violence and belief in late antiquity: Militant devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia, 2009), pp. 144-67. This is most explicitly developed in the second ‘Uthmān-account, discussed below.

terming ‘Amr’s companions *al-‘arab* – an ethnic term not used in the original account – and associating the conquest-army with Bedouin styles of dress, he integrated Ibn Wahb’s account into discourses which constructed ‘the Arabs’ through Bedouin signifiers, and which constructed the original conquest-community as Arab.¹⁰ When the account originated, the ethnicity of ‘Amr and his companions was either a neutral topic, or irrelevant to its author. However, by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father’s day, with the increasing dominance of a Persianised Khurasānī soldiery in Egypt, Egyptian conquest history needed to be Arabised.

b. Predicting ‘Uthmān’s death

The second set of glosses reinterpret the Copt’s prophecy, transforming it from criticism of ‘Uthmān to praise, and thereby from an anti- to a pro-Umayyad message. By presenting the death of ‘Umar as the end of a golden age of unstoppable Islamic conquests, the original account implicitly casts ‘Uthmān’s accession as the beginning of a fallen era for the Muslims. Given that ‘Uthmān was of the Umayyad clan and that the Umayyads represented him as the first Umayyad caliph, the Copt’s prophecy looks like an anti-Umayyad stab.¹¹ The biographies of the earliest transmitters in the *riwāya* support the contention that this was an originally

¹⁰ The *kisā* which is referenced was originally an unsewn ‘oblong piece of cloth’, see Lane Supp., 3000c, while the *burūd* was a oblong garment worn by ‘the Arabs of the desert’, see Lane, 184b. The report states that ‘Amr ordered them to *ishtimāl al-ṣammā*’, a particular way in which desert dwellers would wrap themselves in a garment and hoist it so their ‘pudendum’ was showing, see Lane, 1724c. One can only imagine what the Romans thought. On constructions of Arabness, see P. Webb, *Imagining the Arabs: Arab identity and the rise of Islam* (Edinburgh, 2016).

¹¹ P. Crone and M. Hinds, *God’s Caliph: Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 32-3.

anti-Umayyad account. The *riwāya* claims that the account originates with a Lakhmī and the two earliest identifiable transmitters of the account were both from the Maʿāfir tribe.¹² Maʿāfir and Lakhm had a shared history in Egypt of resistance to the Umayyads. When Marwān I violently wrested Egypt from the Zubayrid camp in the second *fitna*, al-Kindī's *Book of Governors* tells us that Maʿāfir bore the brunt of the fighting on the Zubayrid side. Even after Marwān was victorious he had to execute the chief of the Lakhm tribe in Egypt and a hard-core of eighty Maʿāfirīs who refused to renounce their allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr, provoking a riot which nearly cost Marwān his life.¹³ Despite being one of the most populous tribes in Egypt, no Maʿāfirī ever held office under Umayyad rule in Egypt.¹⁴ The only Lakhmī to do so was appointed in the dynasty's final year. The marginalised Lakhm and Maʿāfir tribes would have been a natural home for anti-Umayyad memory in Egypt.

Two anonymous glosses, clearly distinguished from the account, overturn this message.

Firstly, a derivative version of the cavalry sortie makes the hero not a Lakhmī but Khārīja b.

¹² Sharāḥīl b. Yazīd, d. after 120/737-8, TI 3/430; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Shurayḥ, d. 167/783-4, TI 4/435-6.

¹³ KWQ 43-6. The mass-execution of Maʿāfirīs took place in 685; Sharāḥīl, see the footnote above, plausibly witnesses his relatives' deaths at the hands of Marwān.

¹⁴ Sobhi Bouderbala, 'Ġund Miṣr: étude de l'administration militaire dans l'Égypte des débuts de l'Islam 21/642 – 218/833' (Ph.D. thesis, Paris-Sorbonne, 2008), pp. 314-325 usefully collects the governors and 'police-chiefs' (*aṣḥāb al-shurṭa*) of Egypt. KWQ pp. 3 - 4 lists the judges. Bouderbala notes the preponderance of Maʿāfirīs in the wider Egyptian population in 'Ġund Miṣr', p. 127. This is backed up by my own tribal breakdown of all Egyptians named by al-Dhahabī in his *Taʾrīkh al-Islām* who died before 270 AH, in which Maʿāfir is the second most numerous tribe, claiming 18 of the 298 individuals for whom tribal data is available. Lakhm provides a respectable 7 entries. My breakdown is a rough heuristic rather than a statistical reflection of the early Islamic Egyptian population, but it is promising that the four tribes which Bouderbala (p. 127) claims from his own research to have made up the majority of the conquest army all come in the top five of my breakdown (if we exclude Quraysh, whose members were likely to be over-represented in biographical dictionaries).

Ḥudhāfa. Khārijī was a Qurashī companion who fought on the Umayyad side in the first *fitna* and was chief of police in Egypt for Mu‘āwiya I until he was murdered by a Khārijī rebel while giving the *khuṭba*.¹⁵ Thus, the glossator replaces Lakhmī pride with the glorification of an Umayyad martyr. Secondly, a gloss re-reads the implication of the Copt’s prophesy, adding to and thus contradicting the main account. The gloss tells us how ‘Amr came to realise that the Copt’s prophesy referred to the death of ‘Uthmān, not ‘Umar. It restates that the Copt had said to ‘Amr that his people would be successful until ‘you [i.e. the Muslims] kill the best of yourselves’ (*hattā taqtulū khayrakum*). ‘Umar, killed by a non-Muslim slave, did not fit the bill. On ‘Uthmān’s death ‘Amr understands that this was what the Copt was talking about: thus it was ‘Uthmān who was in fact ‘the best’ of his people, and his murder – an injustice lamented by Umayyad propagandists from Mu‘āwiya onwards – which was the tragic break in Islamic history.¹⁶

If we are looking for the anonymous commentator who tempered and contested the Lakhm-glorifying, anti-‘Uthmān implications of this account, we should look no further than ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama, the man who taught it to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. Ibn Maslama was a client of the Umayyad family. Not only did he bear their tribal *nisba*, but his family’s names strongly suggest that they wore their Umayyad pride on their sleeves. His grandfather Yazīd was the

¹⁵ FM 59, ll. 20-3. For Khārijī’s role in the first *fitna*, KWQ 14-15, his assassination, KWQ 31-2.

¹⁶ The gloss’s point that ‘Umar’s death doesn’t fit the Copt’s prediction is sound – this suggests that the original wording of the Ibn Wahb account might have been something like ‘they will conquer until the best of them is killed’, and that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam changed the text (or followed a changed text) to fit the gloss. For the complex history of ‘Uthmānism’, P. Crone, ‘Uthmāniyya’, EI2, is the starting point.

namesake of the second and ninth Umayyad caliphs; his father Maslama shared his name with the storied Umayyad prince Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik;¹⁷ he himself was the namesake of the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik; and he surely named his own son Marwān after the progenitor of the Marwānid dynasty. Furthermore, he had a rotten reputation as a reliable transmitter of *ḥadīth*.¹⁸ If anyone was capable of doctoring the Ibn Wahb account to make the Copt’s prophecy fit the pro-Umayyad interpretation of his gloss, it was Ibn Maslama. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, an Umayyad client himself, was happy to go along with it. Nevertheless, the textual conservatism of the *ḥadīth*-folk demanded that the contours of the original account survived, even as it was retooled through a gloss. This conservatism has thus offered us an enviable insight into the original significance of a snippet of conquest-memory and how it was reused and contested.

The first *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān: Ibn Lahī‘a’s account

1. The Story

‘Amr advanced with nought but light resistance until he came to Bulbays. There they fought him for about a month before God granted him victory. Then he proceeded with nought but light resistance until he came to Umm Dunayn. There they fought him fiercely . . .¹⁹

¹⁷ On Maslama as a topic of Umayyad memory see ‘La fabrique des héros omeyyades: Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik, le héros combattant’ in A. Borrut, *Entre mémoire et pouvoir: L’espace syrien sous les derniers Omeyyades et les premiers Abbassides* (v. 72-193/692-809) (Leiden, 2011), pp. 229-282.

¹⁸ Ibn Maslama’s family names and his miserable reputation among the *ḥadīth*-folk are encapsulated in TI 5/625-6.

¹⁹ FM 59, ll. 10-13.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam gave the rather ahistorical account of Ibn Wahb a sense of geographic and chronological cogency by relating it in parallel with the first account of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, which does provide a clear narrative of events with named locations for encounters between the invaders and the defenders. Because of the lack of locations for the events described by the Ibn Wahb account, on several occasions these must be entirely inferred by the reader from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s arrangement of them in sequence with events in the first ‘Uthmān-account.²⁰ ‘Uthmān related this account from Ibn Lahī‘a, who invoked the joint authority of his own teachers Ibn Abī Ja‘far and al-Qitbānī. It is some forty-seven lines long in total, which would make it two pages of the modern edition if presented consecutively. While it does present a historical progression, we shall see that both the historicity and the narrative interest of the events of the invasion which it recounts are limited.

Rather, it seems as if these ‘historical events’ are a brief and uninformed means of getting the reader from a well-known story about ‘Amr’s departure from al-Jābiya in Syria to his imposition of *ṣulḥ*-terms on the Copts. Between these events we encounter a named series of locations where apparently significant battles with Roman forces take place.²¹ These trace a direct route from al-Faramā/Pelusium through the eastern Delta to Babylon. While this seems plausible, recent research has shown that a first invasion force probably entered Egypt

²⁰ The Lakhmī cavalry sortie, for example, can only be identified as occurring at Umm Dunayn by the fact that the ‘Uthmān-account has just described ‘Amr’s arrival there.

²¹ al-Faramā, al-Qawāṣir, Bulbays, Umm Dunayn, Babylon. Al-Qawāṣir appears known to the Arab geographic tradition only through its appearance in FM. See MB 4/411.

before ‘Amr’s, making its way to middle Egypt from the eastern desert, having crossed the passes through the eastern coastal mountains.²² ‘Uthmān’s account knows nothing about this force or the fighting in the southern theatre which our best witness to the conquest, John of Nikiu, clearly places before the siege of Babylon.²³ Further, the account’s information on the campaign is stereotypical to the point of verbatim reduplication: ‘Amr repeatedly makes his way ‘with nought but light resistance’²⁴ between locations where ‘the Romans fought him fiercely’ for a period specified in months.²⁵ No details of casualties, heroic acts, or enemy numbers or leadership clutter the journey. After the conquest of Babylon, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam never uses this narrative to give information on the subsequent campaign to Alexandria. This suggests that ‘Amr’s departure and the terms agreed at Babylon were its respective start-point and end-point. One suspects that that the route was deduced from a natural itinerary between ‘Amr’s supposed point of departure at al-Jābiya to his goal at Babylon.

The culmination of this narrative is the agreement of peace-terms: once the walls of Babylon are breached al-Muqawqis asks ‘Amr for a *ṣulḥ* and agrees to the payment of 2 dinars per Copt to the Arabs.²⁶ As such, it conforms to the standard terminology and amount used in the reports which claim that Egypt was conquered by treaty.²⁷ Given the paucity of detail on the

²² Booth, ‘Muslim conquest of Egypt’, pp. 663-7.

²³ Ibid, pp. 649-60.

²⁴ *Tawajjaha/taqaddama/maḍā* ‘Amr lā yudāfa‘u illā bi-l-amri -l-khafīfī, three repetitions at FM 59, ll. 1, 10, 12.

²⁵ *Qātalahu -l-Rūm qitālan shadīdan naḥwan min shahr*, FM 58, l. 18; see three further close variations on this wording at p. 59, ll. 11, 12-13, p. 61, l. 2.

²⁶ FM 63, ll. 17-18.

²⁷ See the positions outlined at FM 84-8; all those giving a specific sum make it two dinars.

invasion and its incompatibility with earlier non-Arabic sources such as John of Nikiu, it seems likely that this account was generated by the desire to historicise a particular position in the *ṣulḥ-ʿanwa* debate, rather than from genuine memory of the conquest, in accordance with Robinson’s model for the uses of conquest history.²⁸

Few digressions distract us from the featureless drive to Babylon and *ṣulḥ*-terms: the only developed narrative is the well-known story of ‘Amr’s use of trickery to gain ‘Umar’s permission to invade Egypt.²⁹ This prefatory story, at eighteen lines, occupies almost 40% of the account. The wording of ‘Uthmān’s version of this story, in contrast to various others accounts of it also given in FM, alludes to several prophetic *ḥadīths* presented at the beginning of FM. In these *ḥadīths*, Muḥammad tells his followers that the people of Egypt will be a strength (*quwwa*) to them and their helpers (*aʿwān*).³⁰ ‘Amr convinces ‘Umar of the benefit of invading Egypt in almost exactly the same terms: it ‘will be a strength (*quwwa*) and an aid (*ʿawn*) to the Muslims’.³¹ Other versions of this clearly widespread story have ‘Amr leave secretly without first asking permission, and have ‘Umar reprimand ‘Amr for his deception of his companions and lack of brotherly care for his fellow-Muslims.³² In contrast, through this reference to the *quwwa/aʿwān ḥadīths*, ‘Uthmān’s account casts ‘Amr’s ruse in a

²⁸ Robinson, *Empire and Elites*, pp. 1-31.

²⁹ FM 56-7.

³⁰ See the *ḥadīth* starting at lines FM 3, ll. 9, 11, 15; p. 4, l. 1.

³¹ FM 56, l. 3.

³² FM 57-8. There is one counter-report in which ‘Umar sends ‘Amr and ‘Uthmān’s concern for the Muslims causes ‘Umar’s attempted recall of ‘Amr.

favourable light by suggesting that his motivation was to bring about the fulfilment of Muḥammad's prophecy to his followers.³³

As we might expect from this opening, 'Amr continues to be the main protagonist throughout, being the subject who stands for the whole army when its progress is described.³⁴

However, we have also seen that 'Umar is a presence in the narrative. He continues to be so, twice sending reinforcements at 'Amr's request. The four commanders of these reinforcements are named and claimed to be worth 1000 men each, expanding the cast of Muslim characters and stressing the presence of other high-ranking companions in the conquest army.³⁵ One of them, al-Zubayr, breaks the stalemate at Babylon by scaling the wall and opening the gate.³⁶ As for the army, whereas the Ibn Wahb account simply had them as the companions of 'Amr, here they are definitively 'the Muslims', though on a couple of occasions the term 'the Arabs' is used interchangeably.³⁷ There is no attempt to develop an ethnic characterisation, however, in the way which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's father's supplement to the Ibn Wahb account did. 'The Romans' fight 'Amr but in the final treaty the terms are

³³ It must be acknowledged that it is impossible to establish the chronological priority of the *ḥadīths* over the account. However, that the account referenced pre-existing *ḥadīths* seems more plausible than several *ḥadīths* being invented to justify 'Amr's conduct in one version of a conquest-story.

³⁴ FM 58, l. 17; p. 59, ll. 1, 10; p. 61, l. 1; p. 62, ll. 4-5.

³⁵ FM 59, 61. They are the future caliphal candidate al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām; al-Miqdād b. 'Amr, one of the first Muslims; 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit, who swore at the first oath of 'Aqaba; and the future governor of Egypt Maslama b. Mukhallad. An alternative suggests Khārija b. Ḥudhāfa, who we saw also being parachuted into the *ḥadīth* of Ibn Wahb, was the fourth.

³⁶ FM 63.

³⁷ *Al-muslimūn*: FM 56, l. 15; p. 57, l. 1; p. 63, ll. 10, 14, 16. *Al-ʿarab*: FM 63, ll. 15, 17.

imposed on ‘the Copts’, showing that this account also participates in the discourse separating the conquest-era population into a hostile/Roman and passive/Coptic binary.

In line with the religious definition of the invaders as Muslims, the account stresses that the underlying cause of events is God’s properly supplicated grant of success to his followers.

‘Umar asks God’s guidance (*astakhāra -llāha*) about whether he should have dispatched ‘Amr, and tells him that if he should proceed he must ask God for aid and victory (*ista‘in bi-llāhi wa-stanṣirhu*).³⁸ The victories on the road are explicitly granted by God through ‘Amr (*fataḥa -llāhu ‘alā yaday [‘Amr]*) rather than, for example, the tactical nous of a flanking cavalry attack as in the Ibn Wahb account.³⁹ When al-Zubayr mounts the fortress walls he makes it clear that it is God who would be the author of any victory brought about by his sacrifice (*ahabu nafsi li-llāhi arjū an yafṭaḥa -llāhu bi-dhālika ‘alā -l-muslimīna*), and it is the cry of *allāhu akbar* from the Muslims which drives the defendants to flight, not actual fighting.⁴⁰ This is *futūḥ*-history reduced to its essential core. Events are drained of their particularity and diversity by their true, unified meaning: the providentially-directed victory of the faithful. Even if the author of the account did not have any actual information about how ‘Amr got from al-Jābiya to Babylon, he knew exactly how it would have happened.

The above analysis suggests that this account preserves very little memory of the conquest.

Rather, it displays a disciplined adherence to *futūḥ*-tropes. There is evident intertextuality

³⁸ FM 56, ll. 13-14.

³⁹ FM 58, ll. 18-19; p. 59, ll. 11-12;

⁴⁰ FM 63, ll. 9-10, 14-15.

between the opening story and *ḥadīths* about the Copts, and between the conclusion of hostilities and juristic literature outlining the supposed terms of Egypt's submission. The narrative was built around elements culled from already-existing prophetic *ḥadīths*, legalistic rulings, and a basic general scheme of how conquest history worked. As such, it appears of little use as empirical evidence for the conquest, and puts in grave doubt attempts to use the progression of events described in the Ibn Wahb account, whose locations – as we have seen – are inferred from Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam juxtaposition of it with the first 'Uthmān-account.

This, of course, does not detract from its usefulness as an indication of the frameworks within which Egyptian Muslims came to narrate the origins of their dominance in Egypt: the conquest was led by 'Amr, whose cunning in contravening 'Umar's order not to invade was justified by his desire to attain benefits Muḥammad had promised for the people; his army was both Muslim and Arab, with 'the Muslims' considered a corporate entity with collective interests; worldly success is brought about through supplication to God and self-sacrifice for him; the conquest was conducted in a controlled, centralised manner where difficulties could be surmounted by reinforcement from the caliph at the centre, which is imagined at al-Jābiya, the important Ghassānid and Umayyad centre, rather than Medina; the Romans were the Muslims' antagonists, with the Copts passive but accepting *ṣulḥ* terms.

2. Authors

Who originally constructed this framework of conquest history? The *riwāya* for this account is as follows:

< Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ - Ibn Lahī'a - 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ja'far and 'Ayyāsh b. 'Abbās al-Qitbānī et al. >

This claims that the account was put together by Ibn Lahī'a using material that he had learned from several of his teachers. He taught this unified account to 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ who then transmitted it to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, who incorporated it into FM. We have already encountered Ibn Lahī'a as one of the two original informants for the 'pre-Islamic history' which 'Uthmān also transmitted to FM. This suggests that FM's larger vision of an Egyptian history which included both pre-Islamic- and Islamic-era history was not Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's innovation. Ibn Lahī'a, two generations earlier, had propagated coherent accounts on both topics.

This might lead us to suspect that Ibn Lahī'a was the actual author of both of these accounts. Ibn Lahī'a, as one of the two earliest-named authorities for 'Uthmān's pre-Islamic account, must have been responsible for the selection of some of its consistent concerns. However, this conquest-account which he transmitted does not share any similarities of detail or theme which would indicate that they originated as part of a single historical vision. In form, they do share a certain leanness and disinterest in providing engaging stories. Yet, the themes of *mulk*, *nubuwwa*, and *ṭughyān* which we observed in the pre-Islamic account are not taken up

in the conquest. Nor are any of the same locations mentioned. The pre-Islamic account's idea that the Egyptians had the *dhimma* of the Romans is not present in this conquest-account, nor is the term *dhimma* used to describe the status of the Copts under the Muslims, suggesting that the relationship between conquerors and conquered was thought about differently by the authors of these accounts. Furthermore, the term Copt, used in this conquest-account, is not present in the pre-Islamic history. The absence of these concerns with which Ibn Lahī'a's presumably infused his pre-Islamic account of Egyptian history, suggests that he did not determine the contents of this conquest-account. This implies that this conquest-account does in fact reflect material taught to Ibn Lahī'a by his informants.

These informants died at the threshold of Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd rule, and therefore the historical ideas which they generated must be understood to be products of the Umayyad period. Al-Qitbānī (d. 133/750-1) is an obscure figure about whom little is known but his name, death-date, and a handful of his teachers and students.⁴¹ Ibn Abī Ja'far (d. 135/752-3) on the other hand, was an Umayyad *mawlā* who had been part of the army which besieged Constantinople in 717, appears to have had close contact with the Umayyads in Egypt, and whose brother was in charge of naval shipbuilding in Egypt under the Umayyads.⁴² Al-Layth

⁴¹ TI 3/719, KTB 7/48. Entries on his son say that he is *qarīb* to Ibn Lahī'a, which could be read as a familial relationship but appears to be a comment on their nearness in terms of legal excellence, see TI 4/425-6, SAN 7/344, TKAR 15/411.

⁴² For his near-death experience at Constantinople, TI 3/690-1, TD 37/410-11. Close contact is indicated by an intimate story told to him by a member of the Umayyad family, TD 25/219-20. For his brother's job as naval shipbuilder, see TI 3/442 – the brother died in 129/746-7 so must have been working for the Umayyads. There is some debate about the exact date of Ibn Abī Ja'far's death, all agreeing that it was shortly after the 'Abbāsīd revolution, see e.g. TD 37/414. He was also considered

b. Saʿd – the greatest early jurist of Egypt – called him ‘a jewel’ and said that when the Egyptians would swear allegiance to a new caliph, Ibn Abī Jaʿfar had the privilege of swearing first, neatly encapsulating both his pre-eminence within Egypt and its association with his loyalty to the regime.⁴³ This pre-eminence is all the more remarkable given that we are told that his father Yasār had originally been a captive taken from Tripoli in Libya. It seems that there was considerable possibility for advancement for freed slaves who became retainers in elite families. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/745-6), another leading jurist and historian of the same generation – the man who was second in line at the *bayʿa* after Ibn Abī Jaʿfar – was apparently the son of a man taken captive during an early raid to Sudan. Even more explicitly than Ibn Abī Jaʿfar, he was remembered as being a partisan of the Umayyads, claiming that, ‘I grew up in Egypt when they were ‘Alids (*hum ‘alawiyya*), but I turned them into ‘Uthmānids’, i.e. supporters of the Umayyads.⁴⁴ It seems likely that any account of the conquest propagated by a figure like Ibn Abī Jaʿfar, whose status was so interwoven with the Umayyad family and state, would have been something like the official line on that history. This would match the bland but ideologically right-on nature of the account.

Ibn Lahīʿa (d. 174/790-1), to whom he taught the account, also came from a family of state-elites: his uncle had been governor of Alexandria and commanded the Egyptian navy in the

to be a client of Kināna, but enough death-date entries consider him to have been an Umayyad *mawlā* for us to think that he had some kind of formal association with the dynasty.

⁴³ TI 3/562.

⁴⁴ TI 3/562-3 for the swearing, his origin, and his claim.

final years of the Umayyad dynasty.⁴⁵ Yet Ibn Lahī‘a accommodated himself to the new regime, joining the ‘Abbāsid governor on military campaign, and eventually benefitting from his contacts within the old elites of Umayyad Egypt to be appointed as chief judge of Egypt.⁴⁶ Thus, as these local elites realigned themselves to maintain their status under the ‘Abbāsids, they propagated, and no doubt adapted, historical visions which first been formulated by their teachers and predecessors under the Umayyads.

Lacking parallel transmissions from Ibn Abī Ja‘far or al-Qitbānī which could be used as a control on the account, we have no means of knowing the nature of their accounts which Ibn Lahī‘a combined, and whether original elements of their teachings were changed or left out. However, several reports do suggest that as this account was passed on its transmitters commented on it by introducing additional reports they had learned from others. It seems that these were then transmitted alongside the main account, just as Ibn Hishām’s glosses on Ibn Ishāq became incorporated in the transmitted text of the *Sīra*, and ended up accompanying it in FM. So, when Ibn Lahī‘a taught the account to ‘Uthmān, it seems that he introduced an alternative version of ‘Amr’s trick with ‘Umar’s letter, which he had learned

⁴⁵ ‘Ayyāsh b. ‘Uqba b. Kulayb al-Ḥaḍramī, for his (contested) relation to Ibn Lahī‘a and his official positions, TKAR 22/558-9, TI 4/174.

⁴⁶ SAN 8/19, TD 32/136, for his presence in Syria on campaign with Ṣāliḥ b. ‘Alī in 138. He may in fact have been participating in Ṣāliḥ’s campaign in the civil war against his own brother in Syria, which took place in 137/753, at which we know other Egyptians who would have future ‘Abbāsid state appointments participated, e.g. Ghawth b. Sulaymān, see KWQ 357-8. Ibn Lahī‘a was appointed chief judge by al-Manṣūr at the recommendation of a delegation to Baghdād made up of Egyptian local grandees, including his uncle, see KWQ 368-9.

from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.⁴⁷ Likewise, when ʿUthmān taught the account to Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam he seems to have included a couple of reports on the authority of < Ibn Wahb – al-Layth > which gloss events in the account. One explains that ʿUmar’s idea that each of the commanders whom he sent was worth 1000 men – presented in the original account – was related to the practice of Khusrau.⁴⁸ Another gives a duration for the siege of Babylon.⁴⁹ Such glosses allow us to see the historical scholars of early Islamic Egypt gathering together their knowledge, combining and juxtaposing different accounts in their teachings – while respecting their integrity by demarcating commentary with *isnāds* – long before Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam taught the version of FM to which we have access today.

The second *ḥadīth* of ʿUthmān: the account of Ibn Ayyūb and Ibn Humayd

‘The treaty of the Copts is intact, according to what you and they agreed, and no breach has come by their power. I carry it out towards you for myself, and the Copts carry it out to you according to the terms by which you made peace and covenant with them. As for the Romans, I am quit of them.’⁵⁰

After presenting the previous two visions of the campaign up to the conquest of Babylon, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam used a second account taught to him by ʿUthmān to present a final version of events at Babylon, and then provide the framework for the drive to Alexandria. This is the longest source he used for the history of the conquest. Altogether it takes up some 249 lines

⁴⁷ FM 57, ll. 4-10. Here ʿAmr does not even have permission to set off, and is castigated by ʿUmar.

⁴⁸ FM 61, ll. 8-13.

⁴⁹ FM 64, ll. 7-9.

⁵⁰ FM 72.

of text, the equivalent of eleven pages. Given that this is the source Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam relies on most heavily for his conquest account, the ideas developed in are fundamental to FM's overall representation of the conquest.

1. The Story

Its story begins with the siege of Babylon and ends with the conquest of Alexandria. The account is notable for its long depiction of the negotiations between al-Muqawqis and either ʿAmr or his representative ʿUbāda b. al-Ṣāmit, which take up about seven pages.⁵¹ It is the exchange of messengers depicted here which provides the most extended characterisation of the virtue of the early Muslims in FM, and which is presented as the cause of their victory. Furthermore, it is this exchange in which the dichotomy between the Coptic and Roman responses to al-Muqawqis' recognition of inevitable Muslim victory is developed. After the defenders at Babylon have disregarded al-Muqawqis' advice, fought, and been driven back from the fortress to the Nile island, al-Muqawqis finally persuades the Copts and Romans in Egypt to submit to a *ṣulḥ*, which is outlined according to the usual terms of 2 dinars per head. Al-Muqawqis asks Heraclius to verify the treaty but instead he demands that his subjects fight the Arabs to the death. The Romans do so, thus breaking the treaty, but al-Muqawqis and the Copts stick to it. Thenceforth, the Romans are the antagonists, while the Copts help and supply the Muslims until Alexandria is forcibly reduced. The account concludes with a summary of the tax implications: all of Egypt was conquered by *ṣulḥ* except Alexandria and

⁵¹ The account is the basis of practically all of FM 65-72.

three villages, yet ‘Umar decreed that even these should not be despoiled nor their populations enslaved, rather they should be treated as if they had a treaty and taxed accordingly for the common benefit of the Muslims.

a. Distinguishing the Copts

The account is fundamentally invested in demonstrating the divergent responses of the ‘Copts’ and the ‘Romans’ to the Muslim invasion. Uninterested in the events of the invasion before Babylon, it begins with a statement distinguishing the ‘Roman’ and ‘Coptic’ elements within the fortress when ‘Amr besieged it: ‘in it was a group of Romans and of Coptic leaders and headmen’.⁵² Thus, from the outset the account insists on this distinction within the non-Muslims. After a token description of some fighting (‘they fought them there for a month’) the account begins its real drama: the negotiations at Babylon whose outcome is the parting of the Copts and Romans.⁵³ Next, when the Muslims set out for Alexandria from Babylon, the Copts’ reconciliation with the Muslims is given practical illustration: the account tell us that the Copts aid the Muslims by repairing roads and setting up bridges and markets.⁵⁴ Again, before the siege of Alexandria we are explicitly informed that ‘the Romans’ are fortified in the city while ‘the leaders of the Copts were with [the Muslims], supplying them with the food and fodder which they required’.⁵⁵ Finally, in the conclusion of the account, ‘Umar’s

⁵² FM 64, l. 13.

⁵³ The key break described at FM 72, ll. 1-4.

⁵⁴ FM 73, ll. 4-5.

⁵⁵ FM 74, ll. 15-17.

summary statement of the legal implications at the end of the conquest explicitly defines the Copts as a separate category to those who resisted the Muslims.⁵⁶

Both the periodisation of the account and its continual reminders of the distinct conduct of Copts and Romans after Babylon demonstrate the centrality of this idea to its intended message. None of FM's other source-accounts stress this distinction so insistently. By drawing the line so clearly – and by associating resistance with the Romans' obedience to Heraclius – Egypt and its 'Coptic' population are absolved. Therefore, despite the fighting which the account depicts, it can still conclude with the summary statement that 'God enabled the conquest of all of Egypt by *ṣulḥ*' (*fataḥa -llāhu arḍa Miṣr kullahā bi-ṣulḥin*).⁵⁷ The account, therefore, functions as a central plank in FM's larger production of a distinction between 'Copts' and 'Romans', which was analysed in Chapter Two.⁵⁸ Given this account's explicit articulation of the contrast between 'Coptic' and 'Roman' responses to the Muslim invasion, we see that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam inherited and expanded upon this theme, rather than concocting it himself. Further, this distinction appears at least in part designed to support the argument that Egypt was conquered by *ṣulḥ*, with all the attendant legal consequences.

b. Echoing *ḥadīth*

⁵⁶ FM 87, l. 20 – FM 88, l. 2.

⁵⁷ FM 87, ll. 20-1.

⁵⁸ See above, pp. 66-72.

Like the first ‘Uthmān-account, this account references the *quwwa/a‘wān ḥadīth*s which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam positions at the beginning of FM, but which must have been in circulation much earlier. It states that ‘the Copts became helpers (*a‘wān*) to [the Muslims] in whatever they needed in fighting the Romans (*qitāl al-Rūm*)’, which closely corresponds to the *ḥadīth* in which Muḥammad states that ‘you will find [the Copts] most excellent helpers (*ni‘ma -l-a‘wān*) in fighting your enemies (*qitāl ‘aduwwikum*)’.⁵⁹ Likewise, the account has ‘Umar describe the *kharāj* of the Copts as a ‘force for the Muslims against their enemies’ (*quwwatan li-l-muslimīna ‘alā ‘aduwwihim*), referencing the *ḥadīth* in which Muḥammad says that the Muslims will encounter a curly-haired people who will be ‘a force to you and a means of reaching your enemies’ (*quwwatun lakum wa-balāghun ilā ‘aduwwikum*).⁶⁰ Whereas the first ‘Uthmān-account used these references to present ‘Amr’s conduct favourably, by making his justification for the invasion of Egypt an echo of Muḥammad’s words, here the presentation more straightforwardly casts the conquest as both fulfilment and thus proof of Muḥammad’s prophecy. Furthermore, by arguing that Muḥammad’s prediction that the Copts would be helpers was borne out in the conquest, the account underscores the injunction in the first half of the *ḥadīth* to the Muslims that they should ‘treat the Copts well’ (*istawṣū bi-l-Qibṭ khayran*).

⁵⁹ FM 73, l. 5: *ṣārat lahumu -l-Qibṭ a‘wānan ‘alā mā arādū min qitāli -l-Rūm*. Compare p. 3, ll. 10-11: *satajidūnahum ni‘ma -l-a‘wānu ‘alā qitāli ‘aduwwikum*.

⁶⁰ FM 4, l. 5; FM 83, l. 18. *Balāgh* is a little obscure here, I follow Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab* (Beirut, 1414AH), v. 8, p. 419, that it means *mā yutaballaghu bihi wa-yutawaṣṣalu ilā -l-shay‘i -l-maṭlūb*. The same combination of *quwwa* and *balāgh* is found in the *ḥadīth* about the prayer for rain, in which Muḥammad asks that what God sends be a *quwwa wa-balāgh ilā khayr*, see Ibn Abi Dā‘ūd, *Sunan* (Beirut, 2009), v. 2, p. 374.

c. Defining the Muslims

The account envisages the invaders foremost as ‘the Muslims’:⁶¹ this is how it describes the invading army as a corporate body,⁶² the beneficiaries of the peace-terms with the Copts,⁶³ and the people to whom God grants victory (*fataḥa -llāhu li-l-muslimīna*).⁶⁴ Only occasionally does the narrative use the term ‘the Arabs’, and mostly when the invaders are being described in direct speech by enemy figures.⁶⁵ Heraclius and al-Muqawqis always refer to the invaders as Arabs, creating a distinction between the narrator’s perspective on the invaders – and that of the assumed audience – and the perspective of characters in the narrative deemed to be part of an external community. In line with this religious definition of the invaders, tribe or region are never used as a means of identifying the actors. This stands in contrast to Ibn Wahb’s account which glorified a Lakhmī, and the first ‘Uthmān-account which specified that ‘Amr’s original army were from the ‘Akk region of the Yemen and reproduced poetry remembering the roles of the tribes of Hamdān, Ṣadaf, and Balī at Babylon.⁶⁶ This lack of particularity in identifying the invaders allows the narrative to cast them as archetypal Muslims, blank figures whose virtuous conduct takes on a normative air.

⁶¹ Twenty-two times, as opposed to seven references to them as Arabs: FM 64, l. 13; 65, l. 11; 69, ll. 10, 12; 70, ll. 7, 8; 73, ll. 3, 10; 74, ll. 13, 14, 15; 76, l. 10; 77, l. 15; 83, ll. 15 (twice), 17, 18; 88, ll. 1, 2.

⁶² FM 64, l. 13; 65, l. 11; 69, ll. 10, 12; 73, l. 3; 74, ll. 14, 15; 76, l. 10; 77, l. 15.

⁶³ FM 70, ll. 7, 8; 83, ll. 15, 17; 87, ll. 21, 22, 23; 88, ll. 1, 2.

⁶⁴ FM 73, l. 10; 74, l. 13.

⁶⁵ There are a total of seven references to the invaders as ‘the Arabs’. Either Heraclius or al-Muqawqis dub them *al-‘arab* at FM 71, ll. 6-7, 9, 20; 76, l. 4. The narrative uses *al-‘arab* to describe the invaders at FM 64, l. 16; 76, ll. 14-15; 77, ll. 18-19.

⁶⁶ ‘Akk: FM 55-6. The Lakhmī: FM 59. Tribes at Babylon, FM 62.

Their virtues are expounded through two devices. Firstly, through the report of al-Muqawqis' messengers. These, 'Amr detains 'so that they' – and therefore also the auditor/reader – 'might see the state of the Muslims'. They then report their discoveries to al-Muqawqis.⁶⁷ Secondly, through 'Ubāda's dismissal of al-Muqawqis' tough talk in the negotiations, which he does by describing the Muslims' hardiness at length.⁶⁸ Both dialogues relate a consistent image of the Muslims, stressing their preference for a martyr's death over life and for humility over rank, their lack of worldly desire, their contentment in discomfort, their lack of signs of social hierarchy, and their assiduousness in prayer and ritual cleanliness. 'Ubāda's discourse adds an appealing element of race-blind meritocracy when his companions reject al-Muqawqis' attempt to rile them over the fact that the black 'Ubāda has been appointed to speak for them.⁶⁹ These values are ascribed entirely to the Muslims' compliance to God and his prophet's instruction:

Thus our Lord has commanded us and thus our prophet has commanded us. He enjoined us that none of us should have any aim in this world but to stave off his hunger and cover his nakedness. Rather, his aim should be to work for his Lord's approval and occupy himself in *jihad* against His enemies.⁷⁰

By ascribing this warrior-asceticism not to the inherent virtue of the early community, but rather to their obedience to revelation and prophetic instruction, the account makes the

⁶⁷ FM 65, ll. 10-11.

⁶⁸ The messenger's report, FM 65, ll. 14-18. 'Ubāda's exposition, FM 66, l. 2-68, l. 2.

⁶⁹ FM 66, ll. 5-11.

⁷⁰ FM 66, l. 23-67, l. 1.

description of the virtues of the invaders normative. It suggests that the special success that they achieved was not unique to them but might be replicated through comparable submission to divine precepts. Thus, the account presents an ideal archetype of Muslim soldiery. Al-Muqawqis functions as a mouthpiece through whom the account models the fear, awe, and general moral collapse that such conduct will inspire in the Muslims' enemies. After both hearing both the report by his messengers and the discourse by 'Ubāda, al-Muqawqis offers responses commenting on the Muslims' asceticism:

'Were these people to confront mountains they would obliterate them! No man has power to fight them!'⁷¹

'I feared his ['Ubāda's] appearance but his speech is more dreadful still . . . I cannot but believe that their dominion will overcome the earth entirely.'⁷²

He also affirms that the success of the Muslims is a result of the virtues that 'Ubāda expounds, allowing the account to forward an explanatory model for the conquests:

'You would not have achieved what you have except through that which you have mentioned, nor would you have conquered those whom you have except for their love of and desire for worldly things.'⁷³

After Heraclius orders the defenders to fight on, al-Muqawqis again explains to them that the Muslims are unstoppable, each worth a hundred Roman soldiers because of their disregard for their own lives, belief in a martyr's death, and lack of mundane desires.⁷⁴ All this gives the exchange of messengers a strongly didactic tone, in which

⁷¹ FM 65, ll. 19-20.

⁷² FM 67, ll. 3-4.

⁷³ FM 67, ll. 5-6.

⁷⁴ FM 71, ll. 13-19.

the appropriate conduct of Muslim fighters is laid out beside the fear it will induce and the inevitable success it will bring. We have extremely little information about the audience or performance context of these earliest historical texts, but it is tempting to suppose that such a message was intended to inculcate this set of values in the soldiers of early Islamic Egypt through the example of their illustrious forbears.

As for named figures, ‘Amr is certainly the main protagonist, as in all three of the conquest-accounts (*wajhs*). His son Ibn ‘Amr and his *mawlā* Wardān also get a mention, as well as Maslama b. Mukhallad, who would govern Egypt for fifteen years under Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān.⁷⁵ However, the hero of the account is ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit, who is chosen by ‘Amr as his negotiator at Babylon and therefore becomes the mouthpiece spelling out the virtue of the Muslim community. When ‘Amr cannot crack the siege of Alexandria, it is only when he hands over command to ‘Ubāda that the city falls. No role is given to al-Zubayr, the first ‘Uthmān-account’s hero of Babylon. Nor do Kurayb b. Abraha, a Lakhmī, or Khārija b. Ḥudhāfa – the figures mentioned in the Ibn-Wahb-account and its glosses – get a mention, showing again the lack of correspondence between these different accounts, which have been traditionally read as if they were a single narrative. All they actually agree on are the basic facts that ‘Amr led the invading army and that there was a siege at Babylon.

⁷⁵ Ibn ‘Amr and Wardān, FM 73, ll. 21-2. For Maslama, the *matns* starting at FM 77, l. 11 and 79, l. 14. For his governorship, KWQ 38-40.

d. Conclusions

In conclusion, we find another account whose main interest was not primarily in relating detailed events of the conquest. Even as it provides more toponyms than the previous accounts,⁷⁶ its information about the things that happened at these places is scant, or at least its narrator had little interest in relaying it. The only detailed action in the entire account is a buddy-story of the falling out and subsequent reconciliation of ‘Amr and Maslama during the fighting at Alexandria, and even this is related with a slightly curtailed *isnad* which suggests that it was a supplement introduced by Khālīd b. Najīḥ, rather than part of an original account.⁷⁷

Like the first ‘Uthmān-account, this account references the *quwwa/a‘wān ḥadīths* about the Copts, and presents the outcome of the conquest as a *ṣulḥ*-treaty which makes all adult male Copts liable to a two-dinar head-tax but no more, suggesting that these were a set of ideas associated with the conquest which predated and informed both of these narrative accounts. Thus, in the case of Egypt, it seems that the construction of the surviving narrative accounts of the conquest post-dated and depended on discussions of the status of Egypt’s non-Muslims which utilised prophetic *ḥadīth* and juristic claims about the implications of conquest-by-*ṣulḥ*

⁷⁶ On the road to Alexandria: Tarnūṭ, FM 73, l. 3; Sharīkh’s Hill, FM 73, l. 3; Kiryawn, FM 73, l. 19; Ḥulwān and Qaṣr Fāris, FM 74, l. 13; Sulṭays, Maṣīl, and Balḥīb, FM 83, l. 13.

⁷⁷ See the *ḵabar* starting at FM 77, l. 11, where Khālīd b. Najīḥ relates to ‘Uthmān from ‘someone trustworthy’ (*al-thiqa*) rather than the usual Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd. Perhaps Ibn Najīḥ thought there should be some actual action in the account. The content is certainly different to anything else related as part of the account.

to argue for a protected status for the Copts. Overwhelmingly though, this account's interest seems to have been in using the set-piece of the negotiations at Babylon to depict a collaborative Coptic response to the Muslims and a hostile Roman response, and to outline a normative vision of the ascetic virtues of the Muslim army.

2. Authors

< Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ - Khālīd b. Najīḥ - Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd - Khālīd b. Yazīd - a group of the *tābiʿīn* >

The earliest named figure in the *riwāya-isnād* for this account is Khālīd b. Yazīd (d. 139/756-7), who we are told related it from a group of the 'followers' (*tābiʿīn*), i.e. from people old enough to have themselves met companions of Muḥammad. As noted earlier, the phrase *yazīdu baʿḍuhum ʿalā baʿḍ* is used to claim that they all gave different accounts which Khālīd then amalgamated. The Arabic biographical tradition tells us that Khālīd's father was a Berber and that he was a client of a client of a man of the Qurashī sub-tribe of Jumāḥ. Thus we encounter yet another early generator of conquest accounts with servile origins, but who was related by clientage to an elite family. He had spent a year with the important Meccan scholar ʿAṭāʾ, and that he lived in Alexandria until his death. He had a good reputation among the *ḥadīth*-critics and was used as a transmitter in all the canonical books of *ḥadīths*.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ TKAR 8/208-10; TI 3/637-8; MT 1/120; SAN, 9/414-5; HM, 1/300; ITK, 4/164-5. For ʿAṭāʾ, see EI2, "Aṭāʾ".

Two members of the next generation transmitted the account from Khālīd b. Yazīd: Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb (d. 168/784-5) and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd (d. 169/785-6). Ibn Ḥumayd is little known in the biographical tradition, beyond his death-date, his being part of the tribe of Mahra, the fact that like Khālīd b. Yazīd he was an Alexandrian, and that he was considered a preacher (*wāʿiẓ*) as well as a scholar (*ʿālim*).⁷⁹ Ibn Ayyūb was known to have travelled widely in the *mashriq*, seeking *ʿilm* in Mecca, Medina, Syria, Egypt, and Iraq, and may have become a judge in his native Egypt. He was remembered as having written a history of Egypt: it is plausible that this account is (or is a part of) what was being referred to.⁸⁰ He was generally held to have been of a client of the tribe of Ghāfiq but was also considered to have been a client of ʿUmar b. Marwān b. al-Ḥakam.⁸¹ This ʿUmar was a brother of the Umayyad caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, lived in Egypt, and apparently advised his nephews the caliphs.⁸² Thus, we see another person involved in both the transmission of our earliest narratives of Egyptian history and bound by clientage to the Umayyads.

Khālīd b. Najīḥ (d. 204/819) apparently transmitted the account to ʿUthmān b. Ṣāliḥ from these two scholars. Of the events of his life, we know only that he was one of the scribes (*kuttāb*) of the controversial chief judge of Egypt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿUmarī (in

⁷⁹ HM 1/279; TKAR 8/39-41; TKB 3/144; TI 4/351.

⁸⁰ Donner refers to this work on the authority of Sezgin, *Narratives*, p. 305.

⁸¹ SAN, 8/5-10; MUA, 1/302; TK, 7/357; HM, 1/300; TKAR, 31/233-8; TI, 4/539-41; ITK, 12/287; TKB 8/260.

⁸² TI /287.

office 185-194/801-2-809-10), so named because of his descent from ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb.⁸³

Khālīd was a client of the family of ‘Umar. Al-‘Umārī, who came from Medina, apparently imported a great many *mawālī* of Quraysh from his hometown to serve as witnesses in his courts. Khālīd, however, is said to be Egyptian in the biographical dictionaries so cannot have been one of them. Nevertheless, the link may have helped his career.

We have encountered Khālīd before, as it is he who ‘Uthmān ‘sometimes’ said taught him the pre-Islamic king-list and related history on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd. As noted there, Ibn Najīḥ was harshly indicted by the *ḥadīth*-critics for ascribing *ḥadīths* to teachers of his who had not in fact heard those *ḥadīths*, with the result that certain unreliable *isnāds* crept into the collections of his students such as ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ and ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ.⁸⁴ It seems Khālīd was not so concerned with the niceties of proper *ḥadīth*-transmission as defined by the rigorists. We might therefore wish to be cautious about the exactitude of his transmission. However, the *riwāya* of this account, leading to a figure who died at the beginning of the ‘Abbāsīd period and thus flourished in the Marwānīd period, hardly makes an extraordinary claim. Indeed, it fits exactly the profile of the other accounts of the conquest, suggesting again that it was this later Marwānīd period which saw the generation of various formal accounts on the topic of the conquest.

⁸³ KWQ 394-5.

⁸⁴ TD 29/186.

How the west was won: ‘Uthmān’s conquest account of the Maghrib

The fifth *juz*’ of FM begins on p. 192, with the title, ‘Those who went out on campaign in the Maghrib after ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ and his conquests’. It continues with an account of the Muslims’ western expansion, which includes the conquests of North Africa and Spain, and finishes with the defeat of the Berber revolts of the 740s on p. 225. This section follows on from material in the fourth *juz*’ about ‘Amr’s consolidation of control over Egypt and his initial forays westwards to gain control over the Pentapolis (al-Barqa) and Tripoli. I will not analyse this material as extensively as I have the Egyptian conquest material, in part because of lack of space, but also because it has been studied rather more than other sections of the book, and is available in decent English translation.⁸⁵ However, it is important to treat it because it follows the same pattern as the other *futūḥ* material in FM, being based on an extensive backbone account transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam from ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, which he then re-used and supplemented. It is therefore the last piece of our picture of how Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam built certain sections of FM from pre-existing narrative accounts.

1. The backbone-narrative.

⁸⁵ See references in N. Clarke, N. Clarke, *Muslim Conquest*, pp. 29-40. For North Africa, see C. Torrey, ‘The Mohammedan conquest of Egypt and North Africa’, *Biblical and Semitic studies; critical and historical essays by the members of the Semitic and Biblical faculty of Yale university* (New York, 1901), pp. 287-330. For Spain, see J. Jones, *Ibn Abd-El-Hakem’s History of the Conquest of Spain* (Goettingen, 1858), though note that proper names are frequently misread in this translation.

The backbone account of FM's 'western conquests' section was not explored in the previous section of the dissertation, as it was not one of the different *wajhs* describing the conquest of Babylon. As such, I will outline the evidence for it before briefly addressing its nature. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's use of a backbone source-account is less explicit in this section, but on inspection is clear. FM's chapter titled 'The conquest of Ifrīqiya' begins with the phrase, 'then he returned to the account of 'Uthmān and others'. In every previous case this formula has indicated the use of a backbone package of material transmitted to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam by 'Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ.⁸⁶ After this, we find further repeated 'returns' to 'Uthmān's account, which Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam uses to indicate that he is resuming use of a main backbone account after his interjection of a report or a comment. These are found through both the narration of the conquest of North Africa and Spain.⁸⁷

However, these 'returns' are relatively thinly spread, and unlike the section on the conquest of Egypt, this section contains quite a lot of apparently unattributed narration introduced merely by *qāla* or not introduced at all.⁸⁸ At first glance we might guess that the subject of this *qāla* is Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam himself. However, it can be shown that the unattributed narration is in fact from the account of 'Uthmān. Firstly, we can see that the unattributed narrative is not Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's, because Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam sometimes introduces alternative reports which contradict the unattributed narration and then comments that the

⁸⁶ FM 183, l. 5,

⁸⁷ E.g. FM 183, ll. 14-15; 184, l. 11; 193, l. 12; 198, l. 7; 199, l. 19; 201, l. 15; 206, l. 19; 211, ll. 9, 24;

⁸⁸ E.g. the passages beginning at FM 192, l. 21; 194, l. 7; 194, l. 10; 196, l. 7; 197, l. 1.

contradiction is correct.⁸⁹ This demonstrates that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam did not feel that he had the authority to alter the unattributed narration, even when he thought it was mistaken. This strongly suggests that it was not his own account, but rather a text he was re-using and commenting upon. More positively, on numerous occasions we see an unattributed narration being interrupted by an interjected report, and then resumed with the phrase, ‘he returned to the account of ‘Uthmān’. In these cases, the ‘Uthmān-account picks up exactly where the unattributed passage left off, and is clearly the same narrative. We also see unattributed narration picking up directly where a passage marked as being from the ‘Uthmān-account left off, before it was interrupted.⁹⁰ This shows that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam expected his reader to

⁸⁹ At FM 197, l. 1 the unattributed narration says that ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘ was dismissed in the year 61 (according to mss B, C, and D; ms A, the basis of Torrey’s text, appears to have been ‘corrected’ to 51). At FM 197, l. 20 – 198, l. 2, the narration says that ‘Uqba complained about this to Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān. At FM 198, ll. 3-5 an alternative report is introduced saying that the caliph was in fact Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam then declares this version sounder, because Mu‘āwiya had already died in 60AH, i.e. before ‘Uqba was dismissed in 61 (thus proving that the original date of dismissal given in the ms. must have been 61).

⁹⁰ The unattributed narration of ‘Uqba’s complaint to Mu‘āwiya, FM 197, l. 20 – 198, l. 2, concludes with Mu‘āwiya saying telling ‘Uqba, ‘I am returning you to your governorship’, i.e. his governorship of Ifrīqiya, which has been taken from him by Abū -l-Muhājir. The next ‘return’ to ‘Uthmān’s account begins, ‘Then ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘ went out swiftly in his rage against Abū -l-Muhājir until he reached Ifrīqiya . . .’

FM 200, l. 9 – 201, l. 14 is a long continuous narrative of Ḥassān b. al-Nu‘mān’s campaigning and ultimate victory against the Kāhina, a female Berber ruler (on whom see the somewhat excitable EI2, ‘al-Kāhina’). This passage is then interrupted with the set phrase used to introduce a dating report from < Ibn Bukayr – al-Layth >, which is lost in a lacuna. Then, what is clearly the same narrative continues, with Ḥassān departing from the location of his final battle with the Kāhina, but it is introduced as a ‘return to the account of ‘Uthmān’, showing that the long apparently unattributed narrative begun at FM 200, l. 9 was in fact ‘Uthmān’s account.

This pattern also obtains in the section on al-Andalus. The long narrative setting up the events of the invasion begins with a *qāla* at FM 204, l. 14 and is not interrupted until FM 206, ll. 14-18, where we find a report on the authority of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father. Immediately afterwards, at FM 206, l. 19, we ‘return to the account of ‘Uthmān’. In this passage, clearly marked as belonging to ‘Uthmān’s account, the Muslim general Ṭāriq immediately engages the soldiers of Cordoba. The last time we met Ṭāriq in the unattributed narration he was setting out from Cartagena for Cordoba, FM

understand that the apparently unattributed narration in this section was in fact from the account of ‘Uthmān. Why he is less consistently explicit about his reliance on ‘Uthmān’s text in this section is unclear, but it may be because the interruption of ‘Uthmān’s narrative is so infrequent and so formulaic. For example, from pp. 210-225, there are only eighteen interruptions of ‘Uthmān’s narrative, which are all single-line dating-reports on the authority of < Ibn Bukayr – al-Layth >.⁹¹ Given the simplicity of the deployment of sources here, it may have seemed superfluous to make explicit that he was returning to ‘Uthmān’s account each time he did so.

2. Identifying the authors.

Who wrote the account and how did it get to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam? The *riwāya* for the new ‘Uthmān-account is established long before the section on the conquest of the Maghrib. At the beginning of the third *juz*, titled *al-khiṭaṭ*, we encounter a new *isnād* from ‘Uthmān, giving as his authorities < Ibn Lahī’a – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb >.⁹² Then, at page 128, we encounter a very

206, l. 5. Clearly, the unattributed narration is again actually the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān, which is now being continued.

For unattributed narration continuing the ‘Uthmān-account see, for example, the end of the previously-discussed passage from the ‘Uthmān-account. There we find Ṭāriq, asking about the table of the prophet Solomon, *wa-sa’ala ‘ani -l-mā’ida*, FM 207, l. 3. A dating report from < Ibn Bukayr – al-Layth > is interjected, and then the narrative continues, *fa-qīla li-Ṭāriq anna -l-mā’idata bi-qal‘atin yuqālu lahā* . . . FM 207, l. 6. This is clearly an unmarked continuation of the ‘Uthmān-account, without it being explicitly flagged with an *isnād*.

⁹¹ See the appendix on pp. 210-25.

⁹² FM 91, l. 2.

similar *isnād* concluded with the diagnostic phrase *yazīdu ba‘duhum ‘alā ba‘d*, with which has introduced every other *riwāya-isnād* from ‘Uthmān. Here, the *isnād* is given as:

< ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ - Ibn Lahī‘a - Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and ‘Abd Allāh b. Hubayra > ⁹³

Two pages later, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam repeats this full *isnād* leading back to Yazīd and Ibn Hubayra, saying that the text is from ‘their account’ (*fī ḥadīthihimā*).⁹⁴ He is clearly treating this report as if it were taken from a longer account transmitted to him from ‘Uthmān on their authority. If we put the content of these three reports together, we get a cogent story of ‘Amr’s settling in al-Fuṣṭāṭ rather than Alexandria, his granting certain tribes permission to settle Giza, across the river from al-Fuṣṭāṭ, and then the administrative arrangements he made for governing Alexandria. Thenceforth, I propose, further references to the ‘*ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān’ are to this package. These ‘returns’ to the ‘Uthmān account in the fourth *juz*’ describe ‘Amr’s imposition of taxes on Egypt, his campaigns westwards against al-Barqa/the Pentapolis and Tripoli, and the Alexandrian revolt while ‘Amr was in Tripoli.’⁹⁵ The topic of ‘Amr’s first western forays leads naturally to the thematic concern of the ‘Uthmān-account’

⁹³ FM 128, l. 14.

⁹⁴ FM 130, l. 12

⁹⁵ FM 151, l.9, with the full *isnād*, giving details about ‘Amr’s imposition of taxes on Egypt. A campaign against the Sudan and the Barqa campaign is given with unattributed narration at FM 169, l. 18 – 170, l. 17, which is concluded with a statement on the authority of < ‘Uthmān – Ibn Lahī‘a > at FM 170, ll. 16-17. Part of the Tripoli campaign is given the full *isnād* at FM 171, l. 9, which seems to follow on from the opening of the account with a *qāla* at FM 171, l. 7. His withdrawal from Tripoli to deal with Alexandria is attributed to the ‘Uthmān-account’, FM 173, l. 11., which appears to be concluded on the authority of ‘Uthmān’s informants < Ibn Lahī‘a – Yazīd > at FM 177, l. 19.

in the section on the conquest of the Maghrib. Furthermore, a shared terminological usage between the report attached to the full *riqwāya-isnād* on p. 128 and a later reference to the ‘Uthmān-account on p. 201 further suggests common authorship. In the first report, ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ makes administrative arrangements for Alexandria ‘once the country was set straight’ (*lammā -staqāmati -l-bilād*).⁹⁶ The same formulation is used in the ‘Uthmān-account to describe Ḥassān b. Nu‘mān’s consolidation of the province of Ifrīqiya after he crushes the last non-Muslim Berber resistance: *aqāma Ḥassān bi-mawḍi‘ihi ḥattā -staqāmat lahu -l-bilād*.⁹⁷ There are no other *isnāds* from ‘Uthmān in this section concluded with the diagnostic phrase *yazīdu ba‘ḍuhum ‘alā ba‘ḍ*, or whose reports are referred to as part of a larger *ḥadīth*. As such the *isnād* to the account which Ibn Lahī‘a collated from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and Ibn Hubayra’s teachings seems by far the most likely indication of the authorship of the backbone account of the western conquests.

‘Uthmān and Ibn Lahī‘a are familiar to us from the *riwāya-isnāds* of the pre-Islamic history and the first ‘Uthmān-account, and indeed Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb has been mentioned in passing in relation to ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ja‘far. Born in 53/672-3, Yazīd was ‘as black as a piece of coal’, the son of a freed slave originally captured in Ibn Abī Sarḥ’s raid on Dongola, modern Sudan, in 31/651-2. He was credited, apparently in his own time, for being the first to institute proper religious knowledge in Egypt (*awwal man sanna -l-‘ilm*), and being the second

⁹⁶ FM 128, l. 13.

⁹⁷ FM 201, l. 18.

in precedence in Egypt to swear allegiance to a new caliph after Ibn Abī Jaʿfar. Apparently, he was one of three men licensed to give *fatwās* in Egypt by ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. He made the magnificent brag that when he was growing up the Egyptians were pro-ʿAlī but that he had turned them into ʿUthmānīs, i.e. supporters of the Umayyads. His biographers claimed that he was no Umayyad stooge, however, presenting a biting remark he made to Marwān II's governor on his deathbed.⁹⁸ He died in 128/745-6, so didn't live to see the fall of the dynasty.⁹⁹ A final point of reference is that he was either a *mawlā* or *ḥalīf* of the Qurashī sub-tribe of ʿĀmir b. Luʿayy, the same tribe as Ibn Abī Sarḥ, the governor who led the raid in which his father was enslaved, and several other important early military figures in Egypt, suggesting that his prominence may have been linked to his clientage to an elite family.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, glorifying his patrons' relative Ibn Abī Sarḥ may have been part of the motivation for writing an account of the western conquests. Unfortunately, the biographical tradition records much less about Ibn Hubayra, beyond his birth in 40/660 and his death in 126/743-4.¹⁰¹

3. The Story

⁹⁸ All taken from TI 3/562-3. The governor in question, al-Ḥawthara b. Suhayl, had seized control for Marwān from the Egyptian *jund*'s self-appointed candidate Ḥaḥṣ b. al-Walīd, killing him and many Egyptian Muslims in the process, TD 14/447-8. When he asked Yazīd whether prayer was permissible with fleas' blood on oneself Yazīd replied, 'Every day you kill men and you ask me about the blood of fleas'. The remark may however indicate some intra-Marwānid partisanship, instead of or as well as a disgust at civil war.

⁹⁹ Further references for Yazīd can be found in Guest, *Book of Governors*, pp. 34-5, though also note SAN, 6/31-3; MUA, 197; TK, 7/356; HM, 299; TKB, 8/336; TKIR, 32/102.

¹⁰⁰ In some of the above sources he is considered a *mawlā* of Azd. Other important ʿĀmirī figures in Egypt are al-Sāʿib b. Hishām, long time police-chief under the Sufyānids, and Busr b. Abī Arṭāt, some of whose military exploits in the west are recorded in FM.

¹⁰¹ TI 3/448; TKAR 16/242-4; MUA 1/194; TK 7/354; HM 1/269.

As already noted, the account begins in the aftermath of ‘Amr’s conquest of Alexandria (*‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ lammā fataḥa -l-Iskandariyya*), the final act of the conquest of Egypt. ‘Amr, under instruction from ‘Umar, founds al-Fuṣṭāṭ rather than settling in Alexandria, sees to the settlement of his army and the garrisoning of Alexandria, and institutes the *jizya*.¹⁰² We then learn of ‘Amr’s expansion westwards, to Barqa and Tripoli, perhaps also his dispatch of an expedition to Nubia, and his withdrawal in the face of a revolt in Alexandria.¹⁰³ Then ‘Uthmān’s governor (and milk-brother) ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa’d b. Abī Sarḥ raids Ifrīqiya with ‘Uthmān’s blessing and assistance, killing the Roman ruler Gregory, taking booty, and accepting tribute from the Africans (*ahl Ifrīqiya*), without appointing a governor or founding a *miṣr*.¹⁰⁴ The size of Ibn Abī Sarḥ’s army and the native Africans’ origins in the biblical lineage of Ham are noted.¹⁰⁵ After this, the narrative is based on the leaders assigned to the expeditions to the west, following the fates of Mu‘āwiya b. Ḥudayj, ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘ and Abū -l-Muhājir, including the foundation of al-Qayrawān, and culminating in the death of the latter two at the hands of a Berber ruler, Kusayla, who is then killed while driving out the Muslims from Ifrīqiya at the time of the second *fitna*.¹⁰⁶ After the *fitna*, Ḥassān b. al-Nu‘mān’s successful campaigns against the Kāhina, the legendary Berber queen, are then recounted and conclude

¹⁰² FM 91, ll. 2-7; 128, l. 14 – 129, l. 3; 130, ll. 13-16; 151, ll. 9-13, probably continued at p. 152, ll. 15 – 153, l. 15, which seemingly follows on and shares the *‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ lammā . . .* formula found at the beginning of the account, FM 91, l. 3.

¹⁰³ FM 169, l. 18 – 170, l. 17; 171, ll. 7, 9 – 172, l. 6; 173, ll. 11-14; 177, l. 19 – 178, l. 2. There is more material scattered in this section which looks as if it may be part of the account, but it is rather hard to unpick in this messy section.

¹⁰⁴ FM 183, ll. 5-13, 14-19.

¹⁰⁵ FM 184, ll. 11-12; 185, ll. 10-12;

¹⁰⁶ FM 192, l. 21 – 193, l. 3; 193, ll. 12-21; 194, l. 10 – 196, l. 12; 197, ll. 1-3; 197, ll. 4-14; 197, l. 20 – 198, l. 2; 198, ll. 7-16; 199, l. 19 – 200, l. 3.

with his victory and organisation of the province for the first time.¹⁰⁷ With the regularisation of provincial government, the narrative in North Africa comes to focus more on the governors of Ifrīqiya and their struggles to control their province, rather than on irregular campaigning.¹⁰⁸ A long section is devoted to the invasion of al-Andalus by the governor Mūsā b. Nuṣayr's *mawlā* Ṭāriq b. Ziyād and the following disputes between them over the booty and the glory.¹⁰⁹ A section then recounts internal disputes and faction-fighting over the governorship of al-Andalus and Ifrīqiya in some detail, revolving around the deaths of both of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr's sons whom he had left in charge of each province respectively.¹¹⁰ The rest of the account is taken up with a thorough recounting of the Khārijite Berber revolts from 739 onwards and their consequences, concluding with 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb's suppression of the revolt and mastery of the Maghrib around the time of the 'Abbāsid revolution.¹¹¹

The tone of the account shifts notably over the course of the period it represents.¹¹² The early campaigns are thin on detail of personnel, beyond the commander of the expedition and the odd future Umayyad caliph thrown in for good measure, but thick with folkloric or

¹⁰⁷ FM 200-2.

¹⁰⁸ FM 202-3.

¹⁰⁹ FM 203-11.

¹¹⁰ FM 211-17.

¹¹¹ The Berber revolts begin, FM 217-20. Conflict between Balj b. Bishr and 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb, the survivors of the caliphal army in Spain, FM 220-1. Hishām sends the governor of Egypt, Ḥanzala b. Ṣāfwān, to sort out internal conflict and suppress the Berbers, succeeds by the skin of his teeth, FM 221-3. Chaos ensues after the death of al-Walīd II which 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb uses to drive out Ḥanzala, take over all of the Maghrib, and put down a Ṣufrite uprising in Tripoli.

¹¹² Noted also by Brunschvig, 'Ibn Abdelḥakam', p. 212.

storytelling details. ‘Uqba b. Nāfi^c has three repetitious encounters with three nameless kings, mutilating each of them in a different way as a reminder not to mess with the Arabs, imposing upon each of them exactly the same tribute of 360 slaves;¹¹³ later he calls out to the wild beasts occupying the future site of al-Qayrawān and drives them out with his command;¹¹⁴ during Ḥassān b. al-Nu‘mān’s campaigns Ḥassān benefits from a spy placed in the Berber camp, but while the Kāhina’s clairvoyance has her cry out gnomically how the secret messages are being sent from her camp to Ḥassān b. al-Nu‘mān, she does nothing to stop them.¹¹⁵ After Ḥassān, however, from about the year 76AH, much more prosaic detail becomes available: we know the names of a boorish recruiting sergeant whose unpopularity undoes an expedition,¹¹⁶ of a Madhḥijī tribesman who leads an insurgency against the Romans in the Pentapolis,¹¹⁷ and of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr’s paymaster who betrays him to Sulaymān.¹¹⁸ By the time of the Berber revolts we have a wealth of detail of governors, commanders, and rebels, and their respective actions and movements. It is unlike anything else in FM. The colour of the storytelling remains somewhat through the invasion of al-Andalus, but from then on we are in a world of dry realpolitik and political rivalry. There is even a fairly realistic-sounding battle.¹¹⁹

¹¹³ FM 194-6.

¹¹⁴ FM 196.

¹¹⁵ FM 200-1.

¹¹⁶ FM 202: Jandal b. Ṣakhr.

¹¹⁷ FM 203: ‘Aṭiyya b. Yarbū‘.

¹¹⁸ FM 211: ‘Īsā b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭawīl.

¹¹⁹ FM 219-20.

All this speaks in favour of the authorship as described by the *riwāya-isnād*. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, born in 53AH, would have been in his early twenties when the account starts to get soberer and better informed. An important figure in Marwānid Egypt by his prime, Yazīd would have been well-placed to know about the rivalries and coups happening in Ifrīqiya which are the theme of the last thirty years of the account. The authorship of Yazīd (d. 128) and Ibn Hubayra (d. 126) would also explain the periodisation of the account, which stops rather abruptly in the middle of the ascendancy of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb, the last dated event being given in 126.¹²⁰ It seems likely that what started out as a *futūḥ*-account, making the conquests in the west a natural outgrowth of the Egyptian conquest, became increasingly a well-informed, contemporary record of the campaigns, conflicts, and intrigues of the governors of Ifrīqiya.

Thus we see another fundamental part of FM that appears to be made up of late Umayyad content, combined and amalgamated by Ibn Lahī‘a, from whom it was transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ. The implications of this common pattern of transmission will be taken up in the final section of this chapter. Now that we have outlined the main pre-existing bodies of material which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam relied on when putting together FM, we are ready to move on from the micro-interventions which he made into these narratives by interweaving other reports into their fabric, and to begin to consider the macro-arrangement

¹²⁰ Ibn Hubayra died in 126. The last dated event is at FM 224, l. 4. However, the narrative does continue, briefly and without dates, to the defeat of the Ibādī leader Ismā‘īl b. Ziyād al-Nafūsī, who apparently died in 132, after Yazīd’s death. Perhaps Ibn Lahī‘a continued the account to conclude the story of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb’s dominance in the Maghrib.

he imposed on the historical information he had to hand, and the implications this has for our understanding of his project.

2. Framing the *futūh*: Prefacing and concluding conquest history

The accounts of the conquest of Egypt studied above form the backbone of the second *juz'* of FM, that devoted to the conquest from pages fifty-three to eighty-four. Thus, his authorial activity in these sections was limited to weaving comments and alternative reports into a story whose outline had been determined. However, just as he did in the first *juz'* on the pre-Islamic history of Egypt, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam inserted collections of reports before and after the main narrative of the section which are both generically distinct from it and reliant on different informants. As with the *dhimma-rahim* *ḥadīths* at the beginning of the book and the reports on Alexandria at the end of the pre-Islamic *juz'*, these sections are authorial interventions made by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam which enabled him to curate his reader's experience. Through them, he could prime his reader for particular interpretations, and emphasise what he thought significant about the coming or recently-concluded narratives whose content he did not control because of the textual conservatism of *isnād-khabar* authorship.

From pages forty-five to fifty-three, the opening part of the second *juz'* is titled 'The letter of the prophet of God ﷺ to al-Muqawqis'. This presents various accounts of the embassy

allegedly sent by Muḥammad which was discussed in Chapter Two, as well as reports relating to the union of Muḥammad and Māriya the Copt which resulted from it, some of which were discussed in Chapter Four.¹²¹ This, I argue, is the preface to the conquest narrative. It is notable that the end of this prefatory body of reports is marked by the formula, ‘then he returned to the account of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ’.¹²² This indicates further that the preceding body of information was a separate section added by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, distinct from the backbone narratives of ‘Uthmān which he used as the basis of FM.

At the end of the *juz*’ are two sections alternatively headed ‘Those who said that Egypt was conquered by treaty’ and ‘Those who said Egypt was conquered by force’, from pages eighty-four to ninety. This concluding section presents a series of reports which either explicitly or implicitly argue for either position, sometimes giving the supposed terms of the treaties agreed in full. The generic distinction between these reports and the concluding sections of the conquest accounts, which do present terms and treaties as noted above, is not absolute. However, in the conquest-narrative the presentation of such treaties is determined by the chronological moment at which they were made, whereas in this concluding section there is no consideration of the circumstances in which the treaties were made. Again, at the end of these sections, a new section is started on the authority of ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ, in what I will

¹²¹ See above, pp. 61-5, 137-50.

¹²² FM 53, l. 16.

argue is a new backbone account.¹²³ What was Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam trying to achieve by bookending ‘Uthmān’s conquest-accounts with these sections?

1. The envoy to al-Muqawqis: prefacing the conquest of Egypt

Though it was not part of the accounts of ‘Uthmān which followed it, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam still built his account of Muḥammad’s envoy to al-Muqawqis from several pre-existing accounts; three to be precise. One he related solely on the authority of his teacher Hishām b. Iṣḥāq, a second he claimed originated with Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, and a third was credited to al-Zuhri, who supposedly got it from an older *tābi‘ī*.¹²⁴ Each is a substantial account, the shortest adding up to eighteen lines if combined, the longest thirty-one. Rather than relate them in full one after the other, however, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam related them in parallel, so that FM presents a linear progression through different stages of the story, rather than repeating it in different versions.¹²⁵ The first stage is al-Muqawqis’ reception of Muḥammad’s envoy Ḥāṭib, during which they debate. Al-Muqawqis comes to recognise Muḥammad as a true prophet due to particular aspects of his character, physical appearance, or conduct which he has foreseen.¹²⁶ In the second, al-Muqawqis recognises Muḥammad’s status by sending him gifts, which are

¹²³ FM 91, l. 2. See the following sub-section on ‘‘Uthmān’s conquest of the Maghrib’.

¹²⁴ Hishām b. Iṣḥāq’s account covers some 21 lines, at FM 45, l. 2; 45, l. 14 – 46, l. 13; 47, ll. 6–11. Yazīd’s, at 31 lines, is FM 48, l. 13 – 49, l. 16; 52, ll. 9–11; 52, l. 20 – 53, l. 1. Al-Zuhri’s account is 18 lines in total, FM 45, ll. 3–14; 47, ll. 11–17.

¹²⁵ This should be contrasted to, for example, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s depiction of the siege of Babylon in which he relates his three separate source-accounts distinctly rather than interweaving them into a single sequence as here.

¹²⁶ FM 45, l. 2 – 47, l. 6.

listed.¹²⁷ The final section details Muḥammad's response to those gifts.¹²⁸ This focusses on his relationship with Māriya the Copt and response to the death of their child Ibrāhīm, but also notes his pride in the other gifts he received from Egypt, modelling a positive response to the benefits of Egyptian recognition of Islam.

Each account agrees on this basic progression but has its own focus. Hishām b. Isḥāq's version stresses the envoy Ḥāṭib's need to counter al-Muqawqis' objections to Islam and win him over through debate, which he does.¹²⁹ Yazīd's account is distinguished by the idea that each of al-Muqawqis' gifts was also a test to see whether Muḥammad would respond as a prophet would.¹³⁰ Yazīd's account also includes a fascinating echo of the ʿĀ'isha scandal in which Māriya's fidelity comes into question and is then vindicated.¹³¹ These accounts fit into a body of polemical history-writing in which non-Muslim leaders recognise Muḥammad's prophethood. In a well-known instance of this topos, Heraclius tries to convince his ministers to submit to Islam but must backtrack in the face of their opposition.¹³² By prefixing this

¹²⁷ FM 47, l. 6 – 49, l. 7.

¹²⁸ FM 49, l. 7 – 53, l. 10.

¹²⁹ FM 45, l. 14 – 46, l. 13.

¹³⁰ FM 48, l. 13 – 49, l. 7.

¹³¹ FM 49, ll. 7-16. Muḥammad's becomes consumed by anxiety over Māriya's relationship with a male relative. This is dispelled when, simultaneously, the relative quite literally reveals to ʿUmar that he is a eunuch, and the angel Gabriel clears Māriya to Muḥammad.

¹³² .See, with references, N. El-Cheikh, 'Muḥammad and Heraclius: A study in legitimacy', *Studia Islamica* 89 (1999), pp. 5-21; S. Leder, 'Heraklios erkennt den Propheten: Ein Beispiel für Form und Entstehungsweise narrativer Geschichtskonstruktionen', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 151 (2001), pp. 1-42; and the discussion in J. Weststeijn, 'Tyrant dreamers face Abrahamite interpreters: A recurring motif in al-Ṭabarī's *History*', in M. Bernards (ed.), *Abbāsīd studies IV* (Warminster, 2013), pp. 113-18, with references at p. 113, ft. 52.

theme to ‘Uthmān’s accounts, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam could invoke Muḥammad’s true prophethood as a justification for the conquest and a denigration of the conquered who could not accept the truth that their leaders recognised. Al-Zuhri’s account of the envoy to al-Muqawqis is distinguished by its retelling of Muḥammad’s parable about Jesus’ apostles’ reluctance to evangelise the kings of the earth before sending Ḥaṭīb. This, as I argued in Chapter Two, contributes to a theme of Christian disobedience in contrast to Muslim submission to the will of God and his prophet, which dovetails particularly well with the discussion of those themes in ‘Uthmān’s second account of the conquest. Thus, the identification of this preface as distinct from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s source material shows that he was consciously developing these themes whose importance I argued for earlier in the dissertation.¹³³

The most significant result of this choice, however, is to integrate ‘Uthmān’s *futūḥ*-accounts into the prophetic age and make Muḥammad the first mover in the story of the conquest of Egypt. Rather than the contentious story of ‘Amr’s disobeying ‘Umar to invade, the conquest of Egypt starts with Muḥammad’s evangelising imperative, made most explicit by Muḥammad’s invocation of the Christian apostles as the (failed) precedent for the envoys he is dispatching. The original accounts transmitted through ‘Uthmān do not seem to have placed the accounts in an evangelical explanatory context, focussing rather on the benefits brought to the Muslim community by conquest. However, as we will see from analysis of the

¹³³ See above, Chapter Two.

other new sections which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam added to FM, particularly the *khīṭaṭ*- and *ḥadīth*-sections, this emphasis on the conquests as the moment when Muḥammad’s message was sent out to take root in other countries is central to the way which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam recasts the *futūḥ*.

2. By treaty or by force: Concluding the conquest

By ending his account of the conquest of Egypt with a lengthy excursus of different opinions on whether the conquest was conducted by force (*‘anwatan*) or by treaty (*ṣulḥan*), Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam stressed the theoretical relevance of knowledge of how the conquest was conducted for issues of administration and land tenure. The classical jurists argued that if a territory had originally been conquered by force there were no restrictions on the level of tax which could be imposed on the non-Muslim population, and the land – if not distributed to the conquerors at the time of the conquest – became the inalienable possession of the Muslim community as a whole, limiting the potential for private Muslim land-ownership.¹³⁴

¹³⁴ A. Noth, 'On the Relationship in the Caliphate between Central Power and the Provinces: The 'Ṣulḥ'-'‘Anwa’ Traditions for Egypt and Iraq', in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008). Noth notes that the *isnāds* to interventions in this lead back to scholars operating in the first half of the second/eighth century. Confirmation that at least one treaty-report preserved in FM reflect mid-second/eighth-century official discourse is found in a papyrus diplomatic letter found in Nubia dating to 141/758, which invokes clauses which closely match the terms for Nubia found in a report at FM 189. See M. Hinds and H. Sakkout, 'A letter from the governor of Egypt to the king of Nubia and Muqurra concerning Egyptian-Nubian relations in 141/758', in *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Iḥsān ‘Abbās on his sixtieth birthday* (Beirut, 1981), pp. 209-29.

This topic, as we might expect, attracted considerable juristic interest, and was a focus of thematic collections of legal reports.¹³⁵ It is possible that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam used a pre-existing Egyptian collection on the theme: fifteen out of thirty-eight of his *isnāds* in this section invoke his teacher ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama as his direct authority. Ibn Maslama’s collection seems to have leant heavily towards an interpretation of conquest by force, with twelve of the reports on his authority falling into the ‘*anwa* camp. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, on the other hand, presents a more balanced picture, with seventeen *isnāds* supporting traditions in favour of *ṣulḥ* and twenty-one in favour of ‘*anwa*. Rather than presenting a partisan view, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was demonstrating his familiarity with both sides of the debate. This suggests that the legal implications of the conquest were, rather than an issue which he was personally invested in, an opportunity for him to show his expertise and breadth of relevant knowledge.

As far as we can see from the *isnāds*, it was not always thus. At earlier stages in the *isnāds* for these traditions we find transmitters who appear to have related reports which were near-exclusively in favour of one side or the other. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/745-6) is found relating six reports in favour of treaty and only two advocating of force. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ja‘far (d. 135/752) can be seen relating five traditions supporting treaty and only one in

¹³⁵ Al-Balādhurī’s (d. 892) *Futūḥ al-Buldān* can be read as a huge later compilation of such traditions for the different region of the caliphate. His section on Egypt, FB 211-21, is almost entirely devoted to this debate. More obviously legal-administrative works such as Abū ‘Ubayd’s (d. 224/838) *Kitāb al-kharāj* were also focussed on this debate, see Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, tr. Imran Ahsan Khan Nyazee, *The Book of Revenue* (Reading, 2003).

favour of force.¹³⁶ No transmitters of their generation, in fact, can be found transmitting multiple traditions in favour of force, whereas in the next we find Ibn Lahī‘a (d. 174/790-1) and Ibn Wahb (d. 197/812-13) doing just that.¹³⁷ If scholars’ transmission of multiple reports favouring one side of the debate indicate moments of collection and advocacy of particular sides of the debate, it would seem that in Egypt at least, arguments for *ṣulḥ* were first systematically collected in the late Umayyad period, and only later did other scholars respond to this by arguing for *‘anwa*. This appears to turn on its head Noth’s theory that *ṣulḥ* was a response to *‘anwa*.¹³⁸ It would also fit well with the fact that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s two narrative accounts of the conquest, purportedly from the late Umayyad period, argue in favour of *ṣulḥ*.

Does Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s inclusion of this section hold any significance beyond Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam demonstrating his control of Egyptian *ṣulḥ*-*‘anwa* debates, and offering that expertise to his students? I believe that it does. The body of traditions he presents advocating *ṣulḥ* consistently affords the Copts the status of *dhimma*, and even the reports in favour of *‘anwa* contains the idea that ‘Umar granted the Copts *dhimma*, despite their having been conquered by force. Indeed, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chose to end the section reporting traditions in favour

¹³⁶ For Ibn Abī Ja‘far’s traditions in favour of *ṣulḥ* see FM 85, l.1, 85, l. 3, 85, l. 5, 86, l. 1, 86, l. 7; for Yazīd’s see FM 84, l. 18, 85, l. 13, 86l. 17, 86, l. 21, 87, l. 16.

¹³⁷ Ibn Lahī‘a’s reports in this section favour force 9 to 4; Ibn Wahb’s 6 to 3.

¹³⁸ A fuller justification of this argument, relating advocacy of *ṣulḥ* and *‘anwa* to scholars’ differing relationships to the state, and comparing the different epistemological justifications used on either side of the debate, was presented at a workshop held in Corpus Christi College, Oxford in May 2016, which I am preparing for publication.

of ‘*anwa* with the rather decisive-sounding statement that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb made [Egypt] in its entirety *dhimma*. He caused them to be thus and it has continued as such until this day’.¹³⁹ At this point we recall that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chose to begin FM with a *ḥadīth* stating that the Copts would be conquered by the Muslims, but they should be treated well because of their possession of *raḥim* and *dhimma*.¹⁴⁰

I have already argued that this foregrounding of the *dhimma-raḥim* hadith made a pointed comment that al-Ma’mūn’s imposition of control over Egypt, brutally suppressing the Copts of Bashmūr, was un-Islamic.¹⁴¹ Re-iterations of the *dhimma-raḥim ḥadīth* are scattered through the book, reinforcing the idea that it is central to the message of the work.¹⁴² I suggest that it may also play a structuring role in the text. The first notable event in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s pre-Islamic history of Egypt established the kinship (*raḥim*) between the Copts and Arabs, when Abraham begot Ishmael by Hagar.¹⁴³ Further, it ended with the Copts entering the ‘*dhimma*’ of the Romans.¹⁴⁴ By adding the section on the envoy from al-Muqawqis which we have just inspected, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam chose likewise to begin the Arab conquests with a new manifestation of Arab-Coptic kinship, Muḥammad’s union with Māriya the Copt.¹⁴⁵ Finally,

¹³⁹ FM 90, ll. 20-1.

¹⁴⁰ FM 2-4.

¹⁴¹ See above, pp. 54-5.

¹⁴² FM 109, 139-40, 153.

¹⁴³ FM 10. See l. 16, where Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam interjects a report reminding the reader that Hagar was the mother of the Arabs.

¹⁴⁴ FM 34, l. 1.

¹⁴⁵ As one of the traditions Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam included at the beginning of his book stated, ‘[the Copts]’ relationship [to us] by marriage is because the prophet of God Ṣ took one of them as a

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam added this section, which ensured that his conquest of Egypt ended on the topic of the Copts’ *dhimma* as well. Thus both the pre-Islamic history and the conquest of Egypt began with the Copts’ *raḥim* and ended with their *dhimma*. For Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Muḥammad’s timeless knowledge explained the deep past just as much as the glorious future. At one point in his narrative Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam explicitly instructs the reader to understand the events of the conquest as the fulfilment of one of the prophecies from Muḥammad with which he opened the book. After the Copts join the Muslims after the siege of Babylon, he writes ‘*ṣārat lahumu -l-qibtu a‘wānan kamā jā’a fī-l-ḥadīth*’. By prefacing and concluding his conquest-narrative with re-affirmations of the Copts’ *raḥim* and *dhimma*, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam engineered his conquest narrative to echo the words of Muḥammad.

3. ‘Uthmān’s History? Layers of *ta’līf*

The preceding analysis shows that FM’s *futūḥ*-narrative of Egypt and North Africa is built from three main accounts, each of which was transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ.¹⁴⁶ If we add the account of pre-Islamic history which ‘Uthmān transmitted to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, we see that large sections of FM can be read as Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s much-

concubine, and their kinship (here *nasab*) is because the mother of Ishmael the prophet Ṣ was one of them’. FM 4, ll. 9-10.

¹⁴⁶ The ‘Ibn-Wahb-account’ studied at the beginning of the previous chapter, while clearly a pre-existing narrative, cannot be classed as a backbone narrative due to its reliance on the progression of the first ‘Uthmān-account to historically contextualise its events.

augmented reproduction – adding supplementary reports and commentary – of packages of information taught to him by ‘Uthmān, as depicted in the following table:

Pages	<i>Riwāya</i> of the backbone package ¹⁴⁷	Content
7-37	‘Uthmān and Yaḥyā b. Khālīd – (Khālīd b. Najīḥ) – Ibn Lahī‘a and ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālīd	Pre-Islamic Egypt
53-64	‘Uthmān – Ibn Lahī‘a – al-Qitbānī, Ibn Abī Ja‘far et al	‘Uthmān’s ‘first account’: ‘Amr’s conquest from al-Jābiya to Babylon
64-84	‘Uthmān – Khālīd b. Najīḥ – Ibn Ḥumayd and Ibn Ayyūb – Khālīd b. Yazīd – ‘successors’	‘Uthmān’s ‘second account’: ‘Amr’s conquest from Babylon to Alexandria
169-225 ¹⁴⁸	‘Uthmān – Ibn Lahī‘a – Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and Ibn Hubayra	Western conquests

This raises the possibility that ‘Uthmān had already combined and transmitted these different accounts as a package, whether as an orally-taught body of information supported by notes, or even a more finished and circulated book. While later medieval bibliographic sources were not aware of a history written by ‘Uthmān, the *Naẓm al-Jawhar* of Sa‘īd b. Batrīq – more commonly known as the *Annales* of Eutychius (d. 940) – shows that in the tenth century this Christian chronicler had access to a history written by ‘Uthmān of at least the

¹⁴⁷ By backbone, I mean that for these sections I mean that every report or event can be considered to be either a comment on events already described by the backbone package, or an alternative version of it.

¹⁴⁸ As we have seen, the *riwāya* for this package appears as early as p. 91 and is repeated at pp. 114, 128, 130, 149, 151, but the extent of the material which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam interjects makes it hard to class this package as the backbone before p. 169, as well as the fact that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam does not use the concept of ‘returning’ to the *ḥadīth* of ‘Uthmān until p. 171.

Egyptian conquest.¹⁴⁹ This strongly suggests that ‘Uthmān had compiled a fixed work which formed the basis of FM *futūḥ*-sections proper.

Eutychius’ section on the conquest of Egypt is a close paraphrase of various traditions which we can find in FM related from ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, stripped of their *isnāds* and rationalised into a continuous account, with a little Melkite polemicizing thrown in for good measure. As noted by Breydy, Eutychius never uses material from FM which is not ascribed by its *isnād* to ‘Uthmān.¹⁵⁰ This suggests that he in fact had a work by ‘Uthmān rather than *Futūḥ Miṣr*. Indeed, there are times when we see Eutychius quoting ‘Uthmān continuously where in FM ‘Uthmān’s text has been interrupted by an interjection from Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.¹⁵¹ The simplest explanation for this omission is that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s interjection was not there in the text which Eutychius was working from. This would rather have been a text which contained only ‘Uthmān’s material on the conquest, i.e. a book by ‘Uthmān on the conquest of Egypt. What should be added to Breydy’s comments is that Eutychius cites material both from ‘Uthmān’s ‘first account’ of the conquest of Egypt and from his ‘second account’.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ For his polemical additions, see the negative comments on al-Muqawqis, NJ 143, ll. 7-11. On Eutychius, see M. Breydy, *Études sur Sa‘īd ibn Batriq et ses sources* (Louvain, 1983).

¹⁵⁰ M. Breydy, ‘La Conquête arabe de l’Égypte: un fragment du traditionniste Uthman ibn Salih (144–219 A.H.=761–834 A.D.) identifié dans les Annales d’Eutychios d’Alexandrie (877–940 A.D.)’, *Parole de l’Orient*, 8 (1977–8), pp. 379–96.

¹⁵¹ NJ 143, l. 13 – 144, l. 3 is a continuous version of FM 64, ll. 15–17 and 65, ll. 1–8, both texts ascribed in FM to ‘Uthmān, skipping over Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s interjection at FM 64, ll. 18–20 on the authority of ‘one of the teachers of the Egyptians’, a phrase which I have argued signals a gloss by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.

¹⁵² NJ 143, ll. 5–7 is clearly based on the same text as FM 61, ll. 2–6, although abbreviated and attempting to rationalise ‘Uthmān’s ambiguity about whether there were 8,000 or 12,000 men. In FM this is explicitly ascribed to < ‘Uthmān – Ibn Lahī‘a – al-Qitbānī and Ibn Abī Ja‘far > in the *isnād*

Furthermore, we also see Eutychius quoting a report found in FM with the *isnād* < ‘Uthmān – Ibn Wahb – al-Layth > , which gives the length of the siege of Babylon.¹⁵³ This was therefore not part of either of what Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam explicitly termed an ‘account of ‘Uthmān’, but a gloss on one of them. This shows that Eutychius was working from a text which contained not only ‘Uthmān’s different accounts of the conquest, but also comments on the events described by those main accounts which ‘Uthmān had gleaned from other informants and used to gloss his main source-narratives. The most logical explanation for the pattern of shared text between Eutychius’ *Annales* and FM is that Eutychius was working from a text authored by ‘Uthmān which contained, at the very least, the version of the conquest which ‘Uthmān had learned from Ibn Lahī‘a, the version he had learned from Ibn Najīḥ, and other relevant pieces of information which ‘Uthmān had gathered from other authorities such as Ibn Wahb. This work was either viewed as a sufficiently fixed package that it was orally transmitted together for at least the half-century which separated ‘Uthmān’s death and Eutychius’ hearing it, or had been compiled into a written form which Eutychius used.¹⁵⁴ Either way, Eutychius’ independent use of ‘Uthmān’s material proves that the process of combining and transmitting originally separate accounts of the conquest of Egypt, along with the Egyptian scholarly tradition’s accumulated comments on those accounts, predated Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam by at least a generation.

straddling FM 60-1. But NJ 143, ll. 13-15 derives from the same sources as FM 64, ll. 15-17, which is supported by the *isnād* < ‘Uthmān – Ibn Najīḥ – Ibn Ḥumayd and Ibn Ayyūb – Khālīd b. Yazīd > .

¹⁵³ NJ 143 l. 5, FM 64, ll. 7-9.

¹⁵⁴ ‘Uthmān died in 219/834-5, Eutychius was born in 877. Breydy suggests that Eutychius got the material from ‘Uthmān’s son, the noted traditionist Yahyā b. ‘Uthmān.

We cannot tell from the *Annales* whether ʿUthmān packaged the account of pre-Islamic Egypt and his history of the western conquests into this work along with his accounts of the conquest of Egypt. Eutychius wrote no history of the Islamic conquests in the west, and for biblical-era history he used Christian traditions about the ancient past.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, his lack of quotation of ʿUthmān’s pre-Islamic and western-conquests packages in the *Annales* might equally be because he had no need for ʿUthmān’s information on these topics, or because they were not part of the book of ʿUthmān to which he had access. Nevertheless, given that ʿUthmān was engaged in a process of bringing together different historical accounts and commentary on them, and we know that he transmitted those accounts to Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam as well as the Egyptian conquest-accounts, it seems at least plausible that ʿUthmān’s combined the historical accounts ascribed to him in FM into a collected work, which I will refer to as his *History*. In this scenario, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was not only indebted to ʿUthmān for teaching him the separate narratives which formed the backbone of several different sections of FM, but ʿUthmān’s *History* was also the basis for the macro-arrangement of FM which brought into one body of information Egypt’s pre-Islamic history, its conquest, and the conquests in the west which were launched from Egypt.

¹⁵⁵ Originating in both the Greek chronographic tradition and collections of apocrypha like the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, though Breydy argues he must have done so in Arabic translation. See Breydy, *Études*, pp. 10-23.

4. ‘Uthmān’s History before ‘Uthmān

It is possible that this combination of material goes back even further than ‘Uthmān. As the table above shows, the pre-Islamic history, the first conquest-account of Egypt, and the western-conquests account are all said to have been at least in part transmitted to ‘Uthmān by Ibn Lahī‘a. While we unfortunately lack an independent witness to Ibn Lahī‘a’s transmission of these packages of information as a body, as Eutychius provides for ‘Uthmān, there is no a priori reason why Ibn Lahī‘a could not have composed unified works devised from different topical sections. He was a contemporary of Ibn Ishāq and Mālik b. Anas, placing him in exactly the generation of *muṣannif*s who according to Schoeler began to do exactly this.¹⁵⁶ Indeed, al-Dhahabī records which of Ibn Lahī‘a’s students was the standard transmitter of his topically composed works (*taṣānīfahu*).¹⁵⁷

I propose that, lacking good reasons in this case to disbelieve the evidence of the *isnāds*, we can reconstruct the generation and transmission of the various backbone accounts of FM thus. In the later Marwānīd period various individuals were propagating coherent prose accounts of the conquest of Egypt, or aspects thereof. While not being extensive histories, these were rather more than the atomised eyewitness accounts of particular events which are often taken to be the original building blocks of Arabic history.¹⁵⁸ These accounts were not furnished with *isnāds* to bolster their truth claims. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb composed a similar

¹⁵⁶ Schoeler, *Genesis*, pp. 68-84.

¹⁵⁷ SAN 10/567.

¹⁵⁸ See Donner’s comments on this topic, *Narratives*, pp. 255, 258-9.

account of the early stages of the conquest of North Africa, which he updated with increasing detail to include the events in the west which occurred during his lifetime. Several of the individuals producing these accounts, such as Yazīd and Ibn Abī Jaʿfar, were linked by clientage to either the Umayyads or to notable Egyptian families (*wujūh*), and apparently enjoyed the benefits of state office-holding.¹⁵⁹ These prestigious connections doubtless both afforded these scholars greater status, which gave their visions of history wider and more receptive audiences, and resulted in their production of historical visions ideologically congruous with the Umayyad establishment of the day.

Such uses of the past were surely not the only game in town: the 'Ibn Wahb account' hints that marginalised groups in Egypt, such as the Maʿāfir and Lakhm tribes, produced alternative memories of the conquest whose purpose was to criticise the Marwānid status quo. Even within the establishment which benefitted from Umayyad rule there was no doubt debate and division over various issues: however, the accounts which were generated in this period agree that the conquest was undertaken by treaty (*ṣulḥan*) made with the unresisting Copts, while the hostile Romans were expelled. Both of the main independent (and conflicting) accounts found in FM seem to reference a type of *ḥadīth* in which Muḥammad states that the Copts would be a force (*quwwa*) for the Muslims and would be their helpers

¹⁵⁹ Guest notes that Yazīd and Ibn Abī Jaʿfar were two of three individuals authorised to give *fatwās* in Egypt by ʿUmar II, *Book of Governors*, pp. 34-5. As noted earlier, Ibn Abī Jaʿfar had fought in the Umayyad army at Constantinople and his brother managed the Umayyads' naval shipyards, TI 3/442, 690-1.

(aʿwān) against their enemies. This suggests that part of the motivation driving the production of narrative accounts was to support the notion that Egypt had been conquered by *ṣulḥ*, with the attendant legal consequences. Thus, these accounts were a narrative articulation of the idea that the events, actions, and agreements of the earliest period of Islamic history – and the words of Muḥammad in particular – carried normative weight. The promotion of a normative framework which asserted a positive relationship with the Copts shows that an attempt to construct a workable past with the non-Muslims of Egypt was also an inherent motivation of the production of these narrative accounts. It is possible that these arguments that the taxes on the ‘Copts’ could not be arbitrarily increased may have been a response to attempts by financial administrators dispatched from the imperial centre to raise Egypt’s tax revenue, which sparked a series of destructive tax rebellions from the 720s.

In the next generation, whose members’ lives straddled the Umayyad and ‘Abbāsīd periods, Ibn Lahīʿa was only one of various scholars who learned historical accounts from these teachers and passed them on to their own students. We find various glosses in FM from people not part of the *riwāya-isnāds* of these original accounts, but whose reports nonetheless comment specifically on episodes in the accounts. This points to a wider history of transmission of and commentary on these original accounts than that which is depicted in FM’s *riwāya-isnāds*’ single paths of transmission. These accounts would have been the common property of the Egyptian scholarly community. Shared knowledge and discussion of such accounts and their implications would have been a means of claiming one’s identity as

part of the Egyptian scholarly class, through asserting both one's knowledge of the established Egyptian history and one's participation in the study-circles of the most prominent scholars of the previous generation. This became a more charged act as the 'Abbāsid period witnessed an increasing influx of non-Egyptian elites from Baghdād. Knowledge of Egypt's history and the precedents set by it could be used to claim expertise in how Egypt should be governed – and therefore a place in that governance or at least some kind of state patronage – in the face of dominance from outsiders. This certainly seems to be the point being argued by an anecdote related by 'Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ's son, in which the 'Abbāsid general and Übermensch 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir, having just invaded and restored order to Egypt after the third *fitna*, brings 'Uthmān to his *majlis* because of his knowledge of the terms of the Muslims' relationship with the Nubians.¹⁶⁰

Ibn Lahī'a was one of the most successful of Egyptian scholars in leveraging his local status into 'Abbāsid sponsorship, being appointed chief judge of Egypt by the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Manṣur, a handsomely-paid position which he held for nine years.¹⁶¹ It was he who put together the core package of pre-Islamic history, Egyptian conquest history, and the conquests in the west which undergirds FM's macro-arrangement. The stylistic differences and absence of common terminology or cross-references between these accounts which he

¹⁶⁰ Noted by Guest, *Book of Governors*, pp. 26–7, referring to a story at KM 1/370–1. For Ibn Ṭāhir see E. Marin, 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir', EI2.

¹⁶¹ On the appointment, KWQ 369, plus the information that it carried a salary of 30 dinars per month. One of the delegates, 'Ayyāsh b. 'Uqba, had been a naval commander and governor of Alexandria for the Umayyads, and was apparently also Ibn Lahī'a's uncle, see TI 4/174, TKAR 22/558–9.

transmitted to ‘Uthmān indicate that Ibn Lahī‘a was not their common author, and that they do in fact preserve content established by his informants in the Marwānid period. His account of the conquest was an amalgam of the accounts of two or more of his teachers.¹⁶² To this he added his mentor Yazīd’s account of the conquest and subsequent rule of the Maghrib and al-Andalus, combined with information on the same topic from another teacher, Ibn Hubayra.¹⁶³ Finally, by himself composing and teaching an account of Egypt’s history from before Islam, he could claim a knowledge of Egypt’s history from Noah to ‘Amr’s rule. This cast that event as a step in the progression of sacred history and justified Arab rule in Egypt through the Arabs’ inheritance of prophethood and kingship from Shem and Arphachshad. It was not a configuration of history peddled by a cloistered scholar, but by a major figure in the ruling apparatus of early ‘Abbāsid Egypt. Various biographical stories discuss the implications of the popularity of Ibn Lahī‘a’s study circles and the preponderance of written material in circulation which stemmed from his teachings, all of which suggests that his vision of Egyptian history would have been widely disseminated.¹⁶⁴

One the students in Ibn Lahī‘a’s circles was was ‘Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ. He, as shown by the paraphrases of Eutychius, fixed Ibn Lahī‘a’s teachings into a durable package which added another version of the conquest of Egypt to that which Ibn Lahī‘a had taught. Ibn Lahī‘a’s

¹⁶² Ibn Abī Ja‘far, al-Qitbānī, and *ghayruhumā*.

¹⁶³ Ibn Lahī‘a liked to tell the story that Yazīd had foreseen that he would be judge of Egypt after him, KWQ 369-70. He also claimed to know every word of Yazīd’s teachings, see SAN 8/17.

¹⁶⁴ A cluster of such reports can be found at SAN 8/18-19. At one period in his life he would send out his books to be copied, though he apparently refrained from this later in life, TD 32/146.

account apparently ended with the conquest of Babylon/Fuṣṭāṭ, but ʿUthmān added another account, narrating a push from Babylon to Alexandria, which he had learned from Khālīd b. Najīḥ. Furthermore, ʿUthmān incorporated into his *History* various comments and glosses which had been generated by the previous two generations of scholars' discussions of the different accounts. It was this *History* which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam made the framework around which he based FM. Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was therefore continuing a process of transmitting, commenting on, and augmenting a package of historical material which had been going on for two generations before him (three, if we count the original generation of the accounts).

Chapter Nine:

Recasting the conquests: Old and new in *Futūḥ Miṣr*

The overarching sense of the package of history which Ibn Lahī‘a taught to ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ was that the conquest of Egypt was a fulfilment of the benefits which Muḥammad had prophesied for his followers, the Muslims, who supplicated God and were willing to sacrifice themselves for his glory. Further, the conquests were presented as part of a progression from biblical-era sacred history, the divinely ordained conclusion of a long past of prophets’ engaging with a perennial Egypt. The autochthonous Egyptians, or ‘Copts’, had made peace (*ṣulḥ*) with the Muslims, and the administrative arrangements made by ‘Amr in Egypt established the base from which Islam was spread into the Maghrib. To this configuration of ideas ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ added an account which detailed the conquest of Alexandria by force, while maintaining that the ‘Copts’ had *ṣulḥ* by explicitly demarcating their conduct from that of the ‘Romans’ during the invasion, and stressed that the successful conquest was a result of the early Muslims’ virtuous conformity to the moral and social strictures commanded by Muḥammad and the Koran.

Taking this agglomeration from ‘Uthmān b. Ṣālīḥ, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam re-emphasised the idea that the conquests were part of an Islamic golden age, both a fulfilment and proof of Muḥammad’s prophecy, by prefacing his work with the *quwwa-a‘wān* prophetic *ḥadīths*

referenced within ‘Uthmān’s accounts of the conquest. He also included the *dhimma-raḥim* *ḥadīths* to this preface, and added other introductory and concluding sections which underscored the *dhimma* and *raḥim* possessed by the Egyptians. Thus, he organised his narrative to echo the words of Muḥammad which began it, making history a manifestation of prophecy. Both the Israelite prophets and the heroes of early Islam were graced by the same divine will. This point is explicitly made by a parallel pair of stories Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam presents about the Nile in which both Moses and ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb bring about the river’s life-giving inundation through interceding with God. Thus, both prove to the Egyptians the rightness of their religion. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam concludes the two tales with the statement that ‘God answered by bestowing his favour on ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb just as he answered his prophet Moses’.¹⁶⁵ Time is flattened: any distinction between a biblical age and the Islamic prophetic and *rāshidūn* age is denied.

Beyond ‘Uthmān’s History

Choosing to participate and intervene in this now deeply-rooted tradition of Egyptian scholarship was certainly one the fundamental authorial choices behind *Futūḥ Miṣr*. However, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam expanded this package in a much more ambitious way than ‘Uthmān had, both by weaving in new material to the original narratives and by adding whole new sections to the assemblage. The first practice we have observed in the thoroughgoing additions which he made to the pre-Islamic historical package, using Asad b Mūsā’s stories-of-prophets

¹⁶⁵ FM 150, l. 8 – 151, l. 7.

material. He also integrated much additional material into ‘Uthmān’s conquest-narrative, notably the ‘Ibn Wahb account’. The second practice, his addition of whole new bodies of information, can be considered of two basic types. The first, we have already discussed: the introduction of prefatory or concluding sections which frame the accounts which he inherited from ‘Uthmān. As we have seen, by distinguishing and analysing these ‘framing’ sections, we reveal important indicators of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam aims in composing and teaching FM. The second type is Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s introduction of whole new sections of the book on topics which were not part of ‘Uthmān’s *History*. Understanding these, and their relation to the conquest-history to which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam appended them, is fundamental to understanding Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial undertaking. The new independent sections which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam added are the *khīṭaṭ* describing al-Fuṣṭāṭ which makes up the third *juz*’ of his book, the miscellany of information – much of which was about the early administration of Egypt – which makes up the fourth *juz*’, the sixth *juz*’ on the judges of Egypt, and the seventh on *ḥadīth* transmitted through Egyptian *isnāds*. The length of this dissertation prohibits an extended investigation of these sections. However, given their importance for understanding Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s project I will propose some hypotheses regarding the logics which underpin this expansion of the scope of ‘Uthmān’s *History* in this, the final chapter of the thesis.

Firstly, it should be noted that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s choices about how not to continue the sacred history which he inherited from ‘Uthmān are as important as how he did continue it.

A chapter reconstructing the sources for Egyptian and Islamic history which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had access to but chose not to include, has been excised from this thesis to keep it to length. The key point to note, however, is that there was plenty of material with which to write a political history of Islamic Egypt, as shown by al-Kindī’s *Kitāb al-wulāt*. This book is often ultimately reliant on the same informants used in FM, showing that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam would have had access to the kind of information in *Kitāb al-wulāt*, but consciously chose not to write this kind of history.¹⁶⁶ A tale of periodic civil war, tax rebellions, and squabbling political factions, such as we find in al-Kindī’s work, was no way to conclude the *futūḥ*. It would surely have seemed to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, living through the destructive effects of the fourth *fitna* in Egypt, seeing his father die in a Fustāṭ prison, one brother flogged in the mosque, and another judicially tortured to death, that the golden age of the Islamic state was over. But rather than plain nostalgia for a past era, the rest of FM argues for particular ways in which the Muslim Egyptians of his day were connected to the era of the *futūḥ*, implicitly figuring a particular community, of which he was a part, as the legatees of the sacred history described in the first part of the book.

I will argue that, essentially, the *khiṭaṭ* and the *aḥādīth* are different ways of claiming the legitimacy of the Egyptian legal tradition, its independence, and its position as an essential part of Islamic legal scholarship. The significance of the *futūḥ* to this endeavour is that they

¹⁶⁶ The overlap was recognised by Torrey who in his edition of FM referred his reader to Guest’s section of the *Book of Governors and Judges* for information on the transmitters found in FM. Torrey, *Conquest of Egypt*, p. 4.

were the moment in which Muḥammad's teachings and practice were transplanted into Egyptian soil. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's history of the judges, on the other hand, is about bringing the history of Egypt up to date while stressing that the true continuators of the sacred history which was described by 'Uthmān's pre-Islamic history and *futūḥ* are the jurists, who preserved and continued Muḥammad's practice and made it the basis for the organisation of Islamic society in Egypt.

Khiṭaṭ

The third *juz'* of FM is entitled *al-khiṭaṭ*.¹⁶⁷ In this section of the work Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam does use *isnāds* to present prophetic *ḥadīths* from companions who settled in Egypt, or to relate anecdotes about those early settlers. However, the direct informants for these reports are varied, and give no indication that Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam was reliant on a pre-assembled body of material. Moreover, the bulk of the section is unattributed text describing the city of al-Fuṣṭāṭ. As such, the section as a whole appears to be Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's own composition. One cannot, of course, uncritically conclude that a lack of *isnāds* indicates original textual composition. It is possible that certain types of information – for example the name of an existing place or the observable layout of a city-quarter – might not have been considered to require *isnād*-verification, and might thus pass invisibly from text to text. However, in the case of the *khiṭaṭ* references to individuals and events from within Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's

¹⁶⁷ FM 91-139.

lifetime, along with Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s otherwise stringent use of citation throughout, suggest it was his own work.¹⁶⁸

The section takes the form of a description of al-Fuṣṭāṭ which works out from the mosque of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ at its centre to detail the location of the tribal quarters established after the conquest, along with information about famous buildings, their builders, and their subsequent ownership-history. It has long been recognised as the paramount source for early Islamic Egyptian urban history and the foundational text for an Arabic genre of city-writing. In his study on al-Fuṣṭāṭ, Kubiak remarked on both its ‘exceptional value’ and the fact that it ‘served as the model for a whole series of subsequent treatises of this kind’.¹⁶⁹ Despite this, and in common with the scholarly treatment of the other sections of FM, Kubiak just used it for positive data, and was uninterested in examining the motivation behind its presence in FM and the logics of selection this entailed.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ I accept that this is not conclusive evidence and that these might just be Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s interjections into a pre-existing *khīṭaṭ*-text. It is certainly noticeable that the history of property exchange is mainly focussed on Umayyad-era events. I would happily modify my understanding of this section in the face of a more plausible contrary hypothesis.

¹⁶⁹ W. Kubiak, *al-Fustat: Its foundation and early development* (Cairo, New York, 1987), p. 18.

¹⁷⁰ Rather he invoked Brunschvig to claim that FM was intended merely ‘to give a plausible historical explanation for a number of obscure juridico-religious traditions concerning the conquest of Egypt and North Africa’, *ibid*, pp. 18–19. This shows again how, in the absence of further scholarship, Brunschvig’s analysis of a few traditions has come to furnish a total explanation for a diverse, 320-page text.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was not interested in urban history for its own sake. Rather, he used it to stress that al-Fuṣṭāṭ was a city founded by companions of Muḥammad. He lays out the city, plot by plot, detailing which companion or member of the conquering army was originally allocated that part of the city. This presence of companions among the Egyptian emigrants was fundamental to claims for independent Egyptian knowledge of normative Islamic practice. As the great al-Layth b. Saʿd, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's father's teacher, wrote to Mālik b. Anas:

Many of those very first [companions] who possessed precedence in Islam went out to wage *jihād* in the path of God, seeking His satisfaction. They formed armies and gathered people to them and proclaimed in their midst the Book of God and the *sunna* of his Messenger, not concealing anything they knew. There was in each of their armies a group who knew the Book of God and the *sunna* of his Prophet Ṣ. These did not conceal from [the people in their armies] anything that they knew and they strove to reach their legal opinions regarding such things which were not explained by the Koran or the *sunna*, nor made fixed by Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān, whom the Muslims had chosen for themselves. Nor were those three neglectful or negligent to their armies, rather they wrote [to them] about even the slightest matter regarding the establishment of religion and to warn them against contradicting the Book of God and the *sunna* of His Prophet Ṣ.¹⁷¹

Al-Layth used this vision of early Islamic history to refute Mālik's claim that all Muslim practice ought be subordinated to Medinan practice (*anna -l-nāsa tabaʿun li-ahli -l-Madīna*).¹⁷² Mālik saw normativity as established by the living, cumulative tradition of the Medinans, which descended from but also complemented that of Muḥammad: this was the 'well-trodden path' of his *Muwaṭṭaʿ*.¹⁷³ Al-Layth did not dispute Mālik's notion of this tradition, but argued

¹⁷¹ Ibn Maʿīn, *Taʾrīkh* (Mecca, 1979), v. 4, pp. 488-9.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 488.

¹⁷³ El Shamsy, *Canonization*, pp. 34-43.

for the legitimacy of other normative traditions outside Medina which were rooted in the original practice, as regulated by the oversight of the *rāshidūn* caliphs, of those of Muḥammad's companions who emigrated.¹⁷⁴ This localised version of Mālikism was the dominant scholarly position of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's circle – nearly all of his major informants had studied with both Mālik and al-Layth – and is the necessary context through which we should understand his *khīṭaṭ*. By mapping the original settlement of Muḥammad's companions onto the modern layout of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was turning the very fabric of his city into a reminder that the Egyptian Muslims had been following their own well-trodden paths, in the footsteps of Muḥammad's companions, from the foundation of their rule in Egypt.

As we by now expect of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, he guides his reader to the significance of this section of his work through the inclusion of an introductory body of material of different character to the section's main content. Firstly, two reports explain that ʿAmr did not occupy Alexandria because ʿUmar wrote to him saying that he did not want the Muslims separated from Medina by a body of water.¹⁷⁵ For the same reason, we learn, Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ was told not to settle Ctesiphon but to found al-Kūfa and al-Baṣra. Al-Fuṣṭāṭ is thereby granted the same pedigree as the great garrison-cities (and later legal centres) of Iraq. Furthermore, the very existence of these cities is a manifestation of the *rāshidūn* caliphs' oversight of the

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 94–6.

¹⁷⁵ FM 91, ll. 2–14.

emigrant Muslims, and the emigrants' compliance to their commands. The theme of 'Umar's oversight is reinforced by reports in which 'Umar declares a plot allocated for him to be the common property of the Muslims, and orders 'Amr to tear down a *minbar* he has built in his mosque.¹⁷⁶ Finally, the story of the foundation of 'Amr's mosque in this introductory section encapsulates how Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam wanted to prime his reader to read his *khiṭāṭ*. Using ropes to lay out the plan of the mosque and set right (*mustaqīm*) its orientation, he tells us that 'it was 'Amr and the companions of the Messenger of God who laid the foundations of the *qibla*'.¹⁷⁷ This report, originating with the same al-Layth, conjures up the notion of generations of Egyptians, week after week, gathering in 'Amr's mosque to pray together in the direction established by the companions. The laying out of the mosque becomes an emblem of the Egyptians' continuation of the original right practice of Muḥammad's followers. Thus, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's introductory reports make the very city of al-Fuṣṭāṭ and its built environment into an embodiment of the arguments of al-Layth's letter.

After these introductory reports, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam does not proceed directly to the layout of the city, but instead gives us a four-page list of those remembered as having witnessed the conquest of Egypt.¹⁷⁸ Details of which of them had been present at significant moments for the early community, such as Badr, are provided.¹⁷⁹ *Ḥadīths* related on the authority of

¹⁷⁶ FM 92, ll. 3-6, 9-14.

¹⁷⁷ FM 91, l. 21 – 92, l. 3.

¹⁷⁸ FM 92-6.

¹⁷⁹ FM 96, l. 3.

particular persons are given in order to establish whether or not they had in fact known Muḥammad.¹⁸⁰ The list reinforces the fact that the *khīṭaṭ* is concerned primarily with the companions and the lore of the prophet which they imbued in the city which they settled. This concern is maintained throughout the description, in which matter-of-fact details of the modern city always return to the companions and their knowledge of the prophet. A short sample gives a feel for the texture of the section:

Then go back to Sahl's bath-house. As you head towards the district of the tribe of Mahra, everything on your left belongs to the tribe of Ghāfiq. Then you come to the lane of the Ḥamd, a sub-tribe of Ghāfiq. It is opposite Sahl's bath-house, which is for women only. Down the lane is the mosque of Abū Mūsā al-Ghāfiqī, the only mosque in the lane. Abū Mūsā was a companion of the messenger of God Ṣ. His given name was 'Abd Allāh b. Mālīk, and [the Egyptians] know of two *ḥadīths* from the messenger of God Ṣ on his authority . . . [*isnād*] . . . that he heard Abū Mūsā saying, "The messenger of God said: Let whosoever forges a lie against me enter a dwelling – or a seat – in hell!" . . . [*isnād*] . . . from 'Abd Allāh b. Mālīk, who heard the messenger of God Ṣ saying, "When I perform a minor ablution (*wuḍū'*) while in a major state of ritual impurity (*junub*) I will eat and drink, but I will not pray or read the Koran until I have performed a full ablution (*ightisāl*)."¹⁸¹

The memories of Muḥammad still treasured by the Egyptians are threaded through the streets once walked by the men who bore them. The city itself is a prompt to remember Muḥammad's message and the Muslims who brought it to Egypt with the conquest.

Aude Busine has recently summarised a variety of ways in which late antique Christians expressed civic pride, from accepting, secularising or Christianising existing pagan myths

¹⁸⁰ E.g. FM 95, ll. 8-22, on the dispute over Mu'āwiya b. Ḥudayj.

¹⁸¹ FM 121, ll. 9-19.

about their cities, to creating new local histories by invoking (or inventing) Old Testament, apostolic, or hagiographic pasts.¹⁸² The inhabitants of the new city of al-Fuṣṭāṭ had no need to wrestle with un-Islamic foundation myths, though we have seen how successfully the Muslims could continue this late antique tradition in the Islamicisation of Alexandria's eponymous founder.¹⁸³ While it would have been easy enough to find an ancient prophetic history for Egypt's Muslim capital, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam never suggests this. Indeed, had he wished to integrate al-Fuṣṭāṭ into south Arabian myth, he had a story to hand which made the mythic Yemeni ruler Saba'/ʿAbd Shams b. Yashjub its founder.¹⁸⁴ Rather, his civic pride most closely matches Busine's apostolic mode.¹⁸⁵ We recall that he chose to begin his account of the conquest of Egypt with a favourable comparison of the *muhājirūn* to Jesus' apostles.¹⁸⁶ It is the link provided between Muḥammad and al-Fuṣṭāṭ by his emigrant companions, some of whose graves could be found in the Muqaṭṭam hills, that made Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's city special.¹⁸⁷ It was where 'Amr had pitched his tent as he conquered Egypt for Islam, and for Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam there could be no more sacred location in Egypt than that.

¹⁸² A. Busine, 'The Conquest of the Past. Christian Attitudes towards Civic History', in D. Engels and P. Van Nuffeln (eds.), *Religion and Competition in Antiquity* (Brussels, 2014), pp. 220-36.

¹⁸³ See above, pp. 97-103.

¹⁸⁴ Given that he had Ibn Hishām's *Sīra* he would probably have had access to his work on ancient Arabia. For the foundation-story of Babylon, the forerunner of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, see Ibn Hishām, *al-Tījān fī mulūk Ḥimyar* (Ṣan'ā', 1347 AH), pp. 57-8.

¹⁸⁵ Busine, 'Conquest', pp. 229-30.

¹⁸⁶ FM 45.

¹⁸⁷ FM 157.

A final point to make regarding Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s focus on al-Fuṣṭāṭ as the ultimate locus of Islamic Egypt is what, or whom, it excludes. There is much talk of Umayyad rulers and governors and their buying, selling, and appropriation of property in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, but barely a whisper of the ‘Abbāsids.¹⁸⁸ This makes some sense: presumably their urban interventions were focussed on their capital of al-‘Askar, on the doorstep of al-Fuṣṭāṭ. But this city, the capital of Egypt for over a century when FM was completed in the 860s, gets nary a mention.¹⁸⁹ This is not exactly a hostile move, but there is nothing ‘Abbāsīd whatsoever in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s imagination of the threads which bound the Egyptians to their prophetic heritage. Rather, the figures we meet while walking the streets of al-Fuṣṭāṭ with Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam are his teachers. We find the estate of one of his father’s colleagues, the jurist Ashhab b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, in a lane owned by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s own teacher ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maslama.¹⁹⁰ Later we pass the estate of ‘Amr b. Yazīd, and then Khālīd b. ‘Abd al-Salām, also both scholars from the generation before Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.¹⁹¹ The references to these figures, whom Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam would have known personally, securely date the text of his *khiṭaṭ* to his lifetime, further suggesting that the *khiṭaṭ* was his own innovative project. But moreover, they show us who inhabited the al-Fuṣṭāṭ of his imagination: the scholars who preserved the words and practices of Muḥammad which had been brought to Egypt in the *futūḥ*; the true successors to the conquerors.

¹⁸⁸ The only mentions of ‘Abbāsīd activity are found at FM 110, 112, 114, 117..

¹⁸⁹ The exception, in passing: FM 158.

¹⁹⁰ FM 115, ll. 18-19. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father was the executor of Ashhab’s will, see Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law*, pp. 26-7, and Ibn Maslama is the most frequently cited direct authority in FM. He presumably knew the area well.

¹⁹¹ ‘Amr b. Yazīd: FM 116, l. 3, identified at TI 5/898. Khālīd: FM 121, l. 20, see TS 4/211-2.

The Judges

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam introduces his history of the judges with a series of *ḥadīths* which articulate conflicting positions on the dangers and rewards of judging one’s fellows. A first set stress that there are three types of judges and that two are going to hell. The message is that ignorance or incompetence will not save you: if you try your best yet still judge wrongly you are doomed.¹⁹² A second, milder set argue rather that if you try your best yet judge wrongly you will still be rewarded, though the judge who hits the mark will gain a greater reward.¹⁹³ Then a couple of reports suggest that God aids his judges, and a final report stresses the need for impartiality in judgement especially when one favours one of the litigants, wrapping the idea in a story of the Israelites.¹⁹⁴

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s section on the judges is the first known work of this type and seems to have been quickly influential beyond Egypt. The Iraqi Wakī‘ (d. 306/918) wrote a more ambitious *Akhbār al-Quḍāt* (*Reports of the Judges*), in which he essentially reproduced FM’s section on the judges for his chapter on Egypt.¹⁹⁵ Wakī‘ did not just re-use Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s

¹⁹² FM 226, l. 2 – 227, l. 19.

¹⁹³ FM 227, l. 19 – 228, l. 14.

¹⁹⁴ FM 228, l. 14– 229, l. 10.

¹⁹⁵ AQ 3/220-241. Wakī‘ quotes Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam through the common *rāwī* of all our mss, Ibn Qudayd, though his intermediary informant, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Haytham al-Tamīmī (for whom, see the entry beginning at TD 51/162), is not known from the *riwāyas* of our extant mss of FM. As such AQ bears witness to a transmission of FM, or at least a *juzʿ* from it, unattested by the extant mss. Wakī‘ replicates exactly FM’s first entry on Qays b. Abī -l-‘Āṣ. C.f. AQ 3/220-1 and FM 229-30. He then skips ‘Uthmān b. Qays b. Abī -l-‘Āṣ, then continues with Sulaymān b. ‘Itr al-Tujībī (the edition

Egyptian information, but also followed his organisation by introducing his book with the same *ḥadīths*, in the same order, which preface the judges section in FM.¹⁹⁶ In his article on Wakīʿ in EI2, Reinhart comments that his ‘extensive introductory section has reports from the Prophet condemning bribery and covering other themes that became standard in *Adab al-Ḳāḍī* literature’, though he does not note that at least some of these themes were inherited from Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam.¹⁹⁷

The basic framework is the succession of *qāḍīs*, which is given with dates of the end of their tenure followed by the next entry giving the name of their successor. Often details of the manner of their end of tenure is given, whether they were asked to be excused (*astaʿfā*), were dismissed (*ʿuzila*), or died in office. This seems to be the basic framework, with little or no more information than this given for many judges.¹⁹⁸ Not attempt is made to make a continuous narrative of events, and most of the time details are not given for why a particular judge was dismissed. A list of judges and the dates of their appointment/dismissal seems to

corrupts this name to Sulaymān b. ʿNZ al-Yaḥṣubī) with a close correspondence between FM and AQ, though with some variation in the *isnāds* and the odd omission and supplement. He continues to the entry on ʿĀbis b. Saʿīd, skipping over the information in FM about the appointment of his *ṣāḥib al-shurṭa*, suggesting that Wakīʿ excised material he deemed irrelevant to then judiciary. C.f. AQ 3/221-3 with FM 231-3. The last entry accords with IAH’s text as well, c.f. AQ 3/240-1 with FM 247.

¹⁹⁶ FM begins with a *ḥadīth* saying that ‘he who is appointed judge has been sacrificed without the knife’, versions of which are presented at AQ 1/7-13. The ‘judges are of three types and two are going to hell’ theme is taken up at AQ 1/13-19, before Wakīʿ moves, just as Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam did, to the rewards one can gain from judging, AQ 1/19 onwards. Other *ḥadīths* found in FM’s prefatory section can be also found in AQ’s introduction. Compare AQ 1/62 and FM 228, l. 14 on seeking judgeship; AQ 1/45 and FM 228, l. 18, where ʿUmar rules in favour of a Jew

¹⁹⁷ A. Reinhart, ‘Wakīʿ’, EI2.

¹⁹⁸ Eg. Yūnus b. ʿAṭīyya, FM 236; the entries at the top of FM 240

be the basis for the section. We have seen that the office of the judgeship was important to the scholars whom IAH was indebted to. Ibn Lahī‘a had been a judge. Khālīd b. Najīḥ and Ibn Bukayr, important indirect and direct informants in FM, were both on the staff of the judge al-‘Umarī. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s father had been head of the Court Witnesses for the judge ‘Īsā b. al-Munkadir. Perhaps at this point Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had had access to (or been asked to compile) a list of judges.

Beyond the basic list, there is a certain interest in institutional matters such as when a judge was also a *qāṣṣ*, whatever that might have meant in this early period, details of significant increases in the remuneration of judges, and a brief mention of innovatory documentary practice.¹⁹⁹ However, this is nothing like the material for an institutional history provided by al-Kindī’s *Book of Judges*.²⁰⁰ Likewise, there are occasional notices of whether a judge’s conduct had been praiseworthy (*maḥmūd*) or not, but these are hardly systematic enough to be an overriding concern.²⁰¹ In a few cases, most notably that of Abū Khuzayma, the judges receive a slightly hagiographic treatment but this is very intermittent.²⁰² Most of the ‘praiseworthy’

¹⁹⁹ For notices on joint appointments, see FM 233, 235. For wage-notices, see FM 235 on Ibn Ḥujayra; 236 on Mālīk b. Shuraḥbīl; 241 on Abū Khuzayma paid 10 dinars per month, 243-4 on Ibn Lahī‘a, 246 on ‘Īsā b. al-Munkadir. At FM we learn that al-Mufaḍḍal b. Faḍāla was *awwalu -l-quḍāti bi-Miṣr ṭawwala -l-kutuba*.

²⁰⁰ As used by M. Tillier, *L'invention du cadī : la justice des musulmans, des Juifs et des chrétiens aux premiers siècles de l'Islam* (Paris, 2017), pp. 149-78.

²⁰¹ See the reports to this effect on Khiyār b. Khālīd, FM 240; Yaḥyā b. Maymūn, FM 240; Ismā‘īl b. Yasa‘, FM 244; Abū -l-Ṭāhir, FM 245; Muḥammad b. Masrūq, FM 245; Ibn al-Jarrāḥ, FM 246; Hārūn b. ‘Abd Allāh, FM 246-7.

²⁰² FM 241-3 on Abū Khuzayma, who wouldn’t accept paid holidays, kept up his trade in horse-tackle during his judgeship, stayed impartial even in cases involving his friends, maintained a household so frugal he didn’t have a chair to offer the ‘Abbāsīd governor, heeded advice about maintaining the

judges have no illustration of their qualities: there is no sustained production of a pious archetype. What is noticeable is a concern to point out when judges had been parachuted in from Iraq by ‘Abbāsīd caliphs and whether their adherence to the doctrines of Abū Ḥanīfa had been a problem or not.²⁰³ The struggle for local control of the Egyptian judiciary and the opportunities it offered has been noted as one of the dominant centre-local dynamics in Egypt, and it was clearly important enough to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to be one of the very few details he consistently notes in this section.²⁰⁴ There seems to be a subtle celebration of resistance to ‘Abbāsīd authority. Ḥaywa b. Shurayḥ magnificently refuses to be forced into taking office at sword-point, Khayr b. Nu‘aym goes on strike in protest at the governor springing one of his soldiers from jail, and Abū Khuzayma makes the ‘Abbāsīd governor sit on a saddle outside his house when he comes to call, rather than welcoming him in. Again though, the theme is fleeting rather than programmatic.²⁰⁵ When you would expect Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to wield the knife, in his accounts of the period in which his father died in jail, or of the judge Ibn Abī -l-Layth who flogged one of his brothers and tortured the other to death, for example, we find a deafening silence.²⁰⁶

precedents of his predecessors, and wouldn’t borrow a horse adorned with silver. Other reports of virtuous conduct include Ghawth b. Sulaymān’s accessibility, FM 244, and Abū -l-Ṭāhir’s concern for the common folk.

²⁰³ See, for example, the notices on Ismā‘īl b. Yasa‘, Abū -l-Ṭāhir, Ibn Masrūq, Hāshim al-Bakrī, al-Faḍl b. Ghanīma, and Ibn al-Jarrāḥ, FM 244-6.

²⁰⁴ On this dynamic, see El Shamsy, *Canonization*, pp. 91-144; M. Tillier, ‘Les « premiers » cadis de Fustāṭ et les dynamiques régionales de l’innovation judiciaire (750-833)’, *Annales islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 213-242.

²⁰⁵ FM 241, for Ḥawya; 240-1, for Khayr; 242 for Abū Khuzayma.

²⁰⁶ The fall of ‘Īsā b. al-Munkadir’s reign, which involved the death of his father, is dealt with very obliquely, and the nine years of tenure of Ibn Abī -l-Layth, the scourge of his family during the *miḥna* and afterwards, are barely mentioned, FM 246-7.

In any case, the section only patchily augmented to make it more than a list. This suggests that the role that it played in FM was to do with its coverage rather than its content. The history of the judges was a way of bringing FM up to the present day, which it did, ending with the entry of Bakkār b. Qutayba to the role in 246/860.²⁰⁷ Judges were still often local men in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s time, in contrast to the offices of governor and police-chief. Therefore, the history of the judges provided a way of continuing the history of Egypt – dated via a continual succession of authorities, just as the pre-Islamic section had been – without having to relocate the dating scheme outside of Egypt, to the caliphs, or making it a history of the governors of Egypt, which would reveal the takeover of the Egyptian state from external elites. Rather, in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s vision, the true continuators of the story of the *futūḥ* were not the governors but the judges who strove to adjudicate in accordance with Muḥammad’s practice.

Hadīth

The last and longest *juz*’ of FM is that devoted to *ḥadīths*, and can be viewed as something of a companion-piece to the *khiṭaṭ*.²⁰⁸ Whereas the *khiṭaṭ* mapped the companions who settled

²⁰⁷ Note that Ibn Qudayd, the *rāwī* of all mss. of FM, is explicitly noted to have added the appointments up to the appointment of Abū Zur‘a Muḥammad b. ‘Uthmān in 284, suggesting that the version of FM that we have was fixed or taught by Ibn Qudayd between 284 when Abū Zur‘a was appointed and 292 when his successor, who is not mentioned was appointed. A later marginal note in ms. A updates the list in a very basic form, seemingly to the 330s.

²⁰⁸ FM 248–319.

in Egypt onto the cityscape of al-Fuṣṭāṭ, in the *juz'* titled *al-aḥādīth* Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam attempts to list every companion who came to Egypt along with a selection of the *ḥadīths* which were transmitted from them through Egyptian chains of transmission. As he puts it himself in his introduction to the section, which is by far his most explicit authorial statement in the entire book:

Here I will name those companions of the Messenger of God ﷺ who entered Egypt and from whom the Egyptians transmit with known Egyptians in the line of transmission from them. [I will name also] those people of [other] countries who share with the Egyptians in relating [these *ḥadīths*] from them, as well as that which the Egyptians are unique in [transmitting from them] without others [doing so]. And also, those of [the companions] whose entrance to Egypt is known through [a report with a] a line of transmission to them from non-Egyptians. I have left out a group whom some scholars mention as having a companionship and as having entered Egypt, but regarding which I see no confirmation from any of the scholars who are their teachers. I have also left out many *ḥadīths* from some of those whom I have mentioned, hating to be prolix, confining myself to a selection of their reports.²⁰⁹

There are, by my count, some 449 lines of transmission attached to the *ḥadīths* adduced in the section. Many of these lines of transmission share the first few *isnad*-links. There are for example, eighty-four *isnāds* which share the common *isnād* < Abū -l-Aswad – Ibn Lahīʿa – various > , and thirty-one *isnāds* which begin < Abū Ṣāliḥ ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ – al-Layth b. Saʿd – various > .²¹⁰ These *isnāds* could plausibly indicate written documents of, respectively, Abū -l-Aswad's collection of Ibn Lahīʿa's *ḥadīths* and Abū Ṣāliḥ's collection of al-Layth's.²¹¹ This

²⁰⁹ FM 248, ll. 2-7.

²¹⁰ See appendix.

²¹¹ Certainly, Abū -l-Aswad is described by al-Dhahabī as the *rāwīya* of Ibn Lahīʿa who transmitted his *taṣānīf*, TI 5/470, SAN 10/567; Abū Ṣāliḥ was known to be al-Layth's scribe (*kātib*) and his *riwāya*, TK 7/518, TI 5/597-601, where we hear much about Abū Ṣāliḥ's extensive written *ḥadīth*-materials, and

would accord with the apparent organisation of *ḥadīths* in the papyrus finds documented by Nabia Abbott, which date from exactly Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s generation.²¹² This may indicate that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam compiled this assemblage from packages of *ḥadīths* taught to him by his teachers, which were primarily organised as the collections of the great Egyptian *muḥaddiths* from two generations previous. In any case, these regular *isnāds* do not map onto the organisational scheme of the section. This suggests that the arrangement of *ḥadīths* by the companion to whom they were ultimately ascribed – a kind of *musnad* arrangement – was, as he claimed, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s contribution, achieved by extracting *ḥadīths* from pre-existing collections and arranging them according to the scheme outlined above.

In practice, the arrangement of each entry is very regular. The companion is named. A snippet of biographical information on him may be given, though occasionally this comes at the end of the entry.²¹³ Usually there is no biographical information, however. The number of prophetic *ḥadīths* which the Egyptians have on the companion’s authority is given. This enumeration of prophetic *ḥadīths* ascribed by the Egyptians to a given companion is also a feature of the *khiṭaṭ* section, further pointing to the common purpose undergirding both sections.²¹⁴ At this point, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam may comment on whether these *ḥadīths* are ‘*gharīb*’, i.e. known from this companion only through the transmission of a single ‘successor’

also that he managed al-Layth’s (vast) agricultural revenues and rents (*mughall*) rather than being a strictly scholarly scribe.

²¹² N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II: Qur’anic commentary and tradition* (Chicago, 1967).

²¹³ E.g. FM 248, l. 9; 262, l. 4, where more biographical and onomastic information is presented at the end of the entry, FM 263, ll. 8-10.

²¹⁴ E.g. FM 96, l. 18; 110, ll. 21-2.

(*tābiʿī*).²¹⁵ After this, a selection of these *ḥadīths* is given along with *isnāds*. Where applicable, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam then names whichever successors from other locations share (*sharika*) with Egyptian successors in relating from this companion.²¹⁶ That this ‘sharing’ is the opposite of ‘considering *gharīb*’ is made clear by an editorial comment in the entry on ʿUbāda b. al-Sāmiṭ’s *ḥadīths* in which Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam gives first those *ḥadīths* which are considered *gharīb* and then those *ḥadīths* which others ‘share’ in relating.²¹⁷ If no non-Egyptians relate from the companion this may be stated (or re-stated) at the very end of the entry with the phrase, ‘None but the Egyptians transmit *ḥadīth* from him’.²¹⁸

The focus, therefore, is on the number of *ḥadīths* which the Egyptians have through purely Egyptian lines of transmission to companions who came to Egypt, and whether or not these *ḥadīths* are known on the authority of that companion in the traditions of the other legal centres of the Islamic world. The arrangement by companion precludes any topical or thematic coherence. An arrangement of *ḥadīths* organised atopically but by companion and *isnād* could be a useful scholarly tool, as evidenced by the continued use of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s *Musnad* to this day. However, this requires the systematic reproduction of all available texts and lines of transmission for each *ḥadīth*, and ideally an alphabetical arrangement to facilitate

²¹⁵ The phrase used is *aghrabū bi-l-ḥadīth*, which I take to mean, ‘they consider the *ḥadīth* to be *gharīb*’, for which definition see Lane, 1/2244a, ‘Traced up uninterruptedly to the Apostle of God, but related by only one person of the *tābiʿūn* or of those termed *atbāʿ al-tābiʿūn* or of those termed *atbāʿ al-tābiʿūn*’. For examples, see FM 264, l. 2; 268, l. 5; 271, l. 2; 275, l. 18.

²¹⁶ E.g. FM 254, ll. 1-5; 259, ll. 17-20; 262, ll. 1-2.

²¹⁷ See the comments at FM 271, ll. 2, 21.

²¹⁸ *Lam yarwī ʿanhu ghayru ahli Miṣr*, e.g. FM 284, l. 11; 287, ll. 12-13; 295, l. 10.

reference. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s ordering principle is not aimed at reference.²¹⁹ Nor does he give us the tools for *matn*-criticism that Aḥmad does – we learn that non-Egyptians have parallel *ḥadīths* to the ones he lists, but we don’t learn which of the *ḥadīths* have parallel transmissions, let alone see the alternative texts. Moreover, he even includes sections on some companions who taught no prophetic *ḥadīths* whatsoever.²²⁰ We must conclude that this section was not intended to be a scholarly tool for issuing *fatwās* or doing *rijāl*-criticism. This makes sense: if Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had wanted to write such a work he would surely have done so, rather than appending it to FM. Nevertheless, the point needs to be restated that the mere presence of information with a potential legal use in a text does not mean that the text was supposed to be legally useful in a practical way. Legal material could be put to other purposes.

Here, his focus on distinguishing what was *gharīb* in the Egyptian tradition and what was shared with other legal centres seems to be the key. The shared traditions demonstrate that the Egyptian scholars were participating in a pan-Islamic legal discourse. They had independently transmitted hundreds of *ḥadīths* from companions who came to Egypt and the

²¹⁹ His explicit arrangement seems to be a classification of companions based on those from whom the same prophetic *ḥadīths* are equally known through Egyptian and non-Egyptian traditions, pp. 248-263; those from whom there is divergence in the prophetic *ḥadīths* transmitted in Egyptian and non-Egyptian traditions, pp. 263-312; those from whom non-prophetic precedents are transmitted in Egypt but not elsewhere, pp. 312-17; those companions whose presence in Egypt is known incidentally through a report, pp. 317-18; those whose entered Egypt from whom Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam could find no reports, p. 318; those who al-Wāqidi mentioned as having passed through Egypt on campaign to the Maghrib. This is the only hint in the work that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam knew of al-Wāqidi. If there is an internal ordering principle within these categories, I have not identified it.

²²⁰ FM 312-19.

faithfulness of their transmission was proven by the fact that these matched the *ḥadīths* remembered from those companions in other places. However, alongside those traditions, these same trustworthy Egyptian *tābi‘ūn* had learned prophetic traditions which were unknown elsewhere, sometimes even from companions who were unknown elsewhere. The scale of the *ḥadīth*-collection is too limited to say that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam was arguing for a totally autonomous Egyptian knowledge of Islamic normative practice, or that he was trying to compete with the likes of Ibn Ḥanbal, al-Bukhārī and Muslim in the east. Yet, by stressing these *ḥadīths* known only through Egyptian lines of transmission, he foregrounded the prophetic knowledge that would have been lost were it not for the Egyptians, and argued that any legal compilation would be partial without the Egyptian contribution.

These were important arguments to make within an Egyptian Mālikism which still needed to contest Mālik’s Medina-centric vision of *‘amal*, which was periodically confronted with chief judges parachuted in from Baghdad ruling according to Ḥanafī principles, and which was no doubt aware of the totalising projects of legal canon-formation underway in the east.²²¹ By offering this selection of *ḥadīths* at the end of his book, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam presented his students with the fruits of his apostolic vision of the *futūḥ*, the prophetic knowledge brought to Egypt by the conquerors, some of which was known only to them. The writers of the original accounts of the conquest in FM, collected from the scholars of the late Marwānid

²²¹ For which, see J. Brown, *The canonization of al-Bukhārī and Muslim : the formation and function of the Sunnī Ḥadīth canon* (Leiden, 2007).

period, all ended their accounts of the conquest with the imposition of taxes on the non-Muslims of Egypt. Their authors were members of the Umayyad establishment, receiving stipends from the *dīwān*, at least some of them soldiers themselves. For them, the legacy of the conquest was the tax-gold which flowed into their pockets and was both sign and instrument of their elite status within Egypt. Such a celebration would have made little sense for Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam: he and his like didn’t see a penny of that money, beyond the limited opportunities available through the judiciary. Since 833 al-Ma’mūn’s removal of ‘Arabs’ from the stipends had ensured that Egypt’s tax-revenues went to the Khurāsānī and Turkic military based in al-‘Askar. The additions Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam made to the *futūḥ* he inherited from ‘Uthmān amounted to no less than a recasting of the foundation-narrative of Islamic Egypt. His new sections made the prophetic knowledge brought to Egypt by the companions the true legacy of the *futūḥ*, and transformed the conquerors into the first generation of *muḥaddiths* whose teachings Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and his companions preserved.

Conclusion

The opening paragraph of this thesis noted that its ultimate aim was to find ways to ‘historicise the generation and transmission of historical ideas in the early Islamic period’. This goal has motivated my attempts to trace earlier forms and transmission histories of packages of historical information contained within FM, and how their meaning was reused or appropriated by Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.

Part I of the thesis showed that a ‘surface-reading’ of *Futūḥ Miṣr* allows us to analyse the worlds of meaning established by a particular text, and that we may study early Arabic historical writing as a means of exploring not only how Muslims thought about themselves and the origins of their own community, but also how they labelled, defined and imagined others, such as the Copts. The clear concern of this set of ideas to justify the disempowerment of non-Muslims within Egypt suggests that future research into Muslim textual identity-constructions of subordinated or disenfranchised populations, perhaps integrating the theoretical toolkit of post-colonial studies, would yield productive results.²²² Such lines of investigation should ideally be incorporated into non-literary research into how the state apparatuses of the caliphate sought to govern difference within the empire, how this affected

²²² Such as has been employed in western medieval studies in the past twenty years. See L. Lampert-Weissig, *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (Edinburgh, 2010), for a recent instance of this trend with comprehensive bibliography.

the formation of potential group identities, and how non-Muslim actors responded to the possibilities offered by these attempts to categorise them.

Parts II and III, demonstrating that we can excavate different layers of text and authorship within *Futūḥ Miṣr*, also point to exciting possible future lines of research. The most obvious desideratum is for other studies which find ways to rigorously identify and characterise early packages of Arabic historical narrative and the actors and contexts which produced them. This would enable comparative work on how and why different complexes of historical ideas were developed in different places and circumstances. The concept of the *riwāya-isnād* suggests ways in which this could be done. It should be possible, for example, to build on Jens Scheiner's firm identification of early narratives of the conquest of Damascus.²²³ One could seek instances where an *isnād* associated with a genuinely early *khābar* – whose accurate ascription to an earlier authority can be demonstrated through *isnād-cum-matn* analysis – is used repeatedly in the same extant text. This could plausibly indicate that it is a *riwāya-isnād*. By isolating all the material in the extant work verified by that *riwāya-isnād*, we might be able to build up a package of early information whose origins and transmission history could be analysed using similar techniques to those that were employed in Part III of this thesis. As in all aspects of early Islamic historical studies, use of non-Muslim and non-Arabic texts may also provide leverage on the Arabic tradition. Work by Robert Hoyland and Antoine Borrut

²²³ Schiener, *Die Eroberung von Damaskus*; idem, 'The Conquest of Damascus'; idem, 'Single *Isnāds* or *Riwāyas*?'

has demonstrated that historical writing and remembering did not occur in confessionally-sealed vacuums.²²⁴ Comparison with Syriac or other non-Arabic texts can help us to identify early layers of Arabic historical memory, whose origins and transmission may then be analysed.

Delving into the origins of early packages of Arabic historical information will usually result in conclusions which require some measure of faith in *isnāds*, though I hope that I have shown that relatively cautious criteria may be established for doing this, which defend against charges of rank gullibility, at least. However, no matter what the ultimate origins of the material are, this thesis has demonstrated that it is possible to use *isnāds* to distinguish between different types of authorial activity on the part of composers of our extant texts. We have seen that we may identify sections of FM, such as the conquest-narratives, in which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s repeated return to the same *isnād* show that he was effectively reproducing a previously-assembled text while interjecting other reports to comment on it. These comments can be used to understand particular emphases or interpretations which Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam wished to bring to the original body of material. The *isnāds* in other sections, such as the that on the ‘*qjā’ib* of Alexandria, display a consistent diversity in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s direct informants. They are therefore most likely new assemblages of information which he brought together for the purposes of inclusion in FM, and should be analysed accordingly.

²²⁴ A. Borrut, ‘Remembering Karbalā’: The construction of an early Islamic site of memory’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 42 (2015), pp. 249-82. R. Hoyland, *Theophilus of Edessa’s chronicle and the circulation of historical knowledge in late antiquity and early Islam* (Liverpool, 2011).

Finally, in sections in which *isnāds* and *matns* appear only occasionally, and from diverse direct informants, such as the *khiṭaṭ*, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s authorial activity appears to be composition of new text. Future work on composers of early Arabic historical texts should be able to use the different types of authorship exposed by their use of *isnāds* to pinpoint their authorial activities and personas in exacting ways. Thus, we may gain far greater leverage on the processes which led to the existence of the extant texts which inevitably condition our understanding of the early Islamic world.

In part, this thesis can be seen as an extended attempt to answer Fred Donner’s challenge that scholars often ‘speak loosely of extensive redaction of the tradition, but they seldom bother to identify the people or group(s) who are supposed to have implemented this redaction, or exactly what purposes were served by doing so’.²²⁵ We have seen that by paying close attention to a single text, and by trying to systematically understand and test the claims its composer made about the origins of its information, it is possible to outline discrete pre-existing historical narratives contained within *Futūḥ Miṣr*, and propose a hypothetical, but evidence-based, stratigraphic reading of the different layers of authorship and compilation subsumed within the text. The model I offer of the development of the Egyptian *futūḥ*-writing tradition in the early Islamic period cannot be conclusively proven – as with so many things in history – but it is the most plausible explanation for the existence of the evidence which we have available to us in its extant form. The progression which I describe in the concluding

²²⁵ Donner, *Narratives*, p. 27.

section of Chapter Eight fits well within the frameworks of the development of Arabic historical writing proposed by standard works on the topic by Donner and Robinson.²²⁶ However, this position has not achieved consensus in the field, and received historical understandings must always be tested. Furthermore, there is a difference between being able to generally recognise that there existed some ‘extended, unbroken accounts of considerable length’ in the period 75-150 AH, and being able to pinpoint specific examples, analyse their content and origin, and trace how they were transmitted and incorporated into later works.²²⁷ Grand surveys of overarching historical phenomena – such as Arabic history writing over several centuries – are surely not ends in themselves, but attempts to establish generalising frameworks within which particular examples can be situated and analysed, in order to both nuance that picture and deepen our understanding of other issues of enquiry. There is a place for historiographical revolution, but if that state becomes perpetual all we achieve is stasis. The current study has aimed to both test and build upon currently-established models for the development of Arabic historical writing, and propose techniques for studying individual historical texts which engage productively with the challenges to the historicity of early Arabic historical information first raised by Wansbrough, Cook, and Crone in the 1970s. I hope it has demonstrated that the redaction of earlier texts and the resignification of past events by historical actors need not only be obstacles to study, but can be worthwhile objects of study in themselves.

²²⁶ See, for example, *ibid*, pp. 275-82 or Robinson, *Islamic historiography*, pp. 18-38.

²²⁷ Donner, *Narratives*, p. 280.

Bibliography

Printed Primary Sources

- Abū -l-‘Arab, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Tamīmī, *al-Miḥan* (Riyad, ١٩٨٤)
- Abū Naḍr al-Kalābādhī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan, *al-Hidāya wa-l-irshād fī ma‘rifat al-thiqa al-sadād* (Beirut, 1407 AH)
- Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh, *Ta’rīkh Iṣbahān* (Beirut, 1990)
- Abū Rifā‘a ‘Umāra b. Wathīma b. Mūsā al-Fārisī al-Fasawī, *Kitāb bad’ al-khalq wa-qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā’*, ed. R. Khoury, *Les légendes prophétique dans l’Islam* (Wiesbaden, 1978)
- Abū ‘Ubayd, al-Qāsim b. Salām, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, tr. Imran Ahsan Khan Nyazee, *The Book of Revenue* (Reading, 2003)
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ūṭ (Beirut, 2001)
- P. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and seventh-century heresy : the Synodical letter and other documents : introduction, texts, translations, and commentary* (Oxford, 2009)
- Asad b. Mūsā, *Kitāb az-zuhd* (Wiesbaden, 1976)
- Asad b. Mūsā, *al-Zuhd* (Cairo, 1993)
- al-Baghawī, *Mu‘jam al-ṣaḥāba* (Kuwait, 2000)
- al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-buldān* (Beirut, 1988)
- al-Balādhurī, Abu al-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, *Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān*, ed. and tr. P. Hitti, *The Origins of the Islamic State* (New York, 1916)
- al-Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-Awsaṭ* (Cairo, 1977)
- al-Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-Kabīr* (Hyderabad, no date)
- Pseudo-Callisthenes, *A History of the Great World Conqueror, Alexander of Macedon*, ed. and tr. A. Wolohojian, *The romance of Alexander the Great: translated from the Armenian version with an introduction by Albert Mugrdich Wolohojian* (New York, 1969)
- al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-‘tidāl* (Beirut, 1963)
- al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā’* (Beirut, 1985)
- al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh al-islām* (Beirut, 2003)

Eutychius, Saʿīd b. Batrīq, *Naẓm al-Jawhar*, ed. M. Breydy, *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien: ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Saʿīd ibn Batrīq um 935 A.D.* (Louvain, 1985).

al-Fasawī, *al-Maʿrifa wa-l-taʾrīkh* (Beirut, 1981).

Ḥājji Khalifa, *Kashf al-zunūn ʿan asāmī al-kutub wa al-funūn* (Baghdad, 1941)

History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria, ed. and tr. O. Burmester, B. Evetts, A. Khater, A. Atiya (Paris, 1904-)

Ibn ʿAṭiyya, *Fahrasat Ibn ʿAṭiyya* (Beirut, 1983)

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh, Abū -l-Qāsim, *Futūḥ Miṣr*, partial translation and edition, J. Jones, *Ibn Abd-El-Hakem's History of the Conquest of Spain* (Goettingen, 1858)

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh, Abū -l-Qāsim, *Futūḥ Miṣr*, partial translation, C. Torrey, 'The Mohammedan conquest of Egypt and North Africa', *Biblical and Semitic studies; critical and historical essays by the members of the Semitic and Biblical faculty of Yale university* (New York, 1901), pp. 287-330.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh, Abū -l-Qāsim, *Futūḥ Miṣr* ed. C. Torrey, *The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain known as the Futūḥ Miṣr of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam* (New Haven, 1922)

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-l-Maghrib* (Cairo, 1415 AH)

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-akhbāruhā* (Cairo, *Muʿassasat Dār al-Taʾāwun li-l-Ṭabʿ wa-l-Nashr*, no date)

Ibn b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, Abū ʿAbd Allāh, *Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz* (Beirut, 1984)

Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh Dimashq* (Amman, 1995)

Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*, (Cairo, 1955)

Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*, tr. A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sirat Rasul Allah* (London, 1955)

Ibn Maʿīn, *Taʾrīkh Ibn Maʿīn* (Mecca, 1979)

Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (Beirut, 1997)

Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, tr. Bayard Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: a tenth-century survey of Muslim culture* (New York, 1970)

Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba* (Beirut, 1415 AH)

Ibn Hajar, *Lisān al-Mizān* (Beirut, 1971).

Ibn Hajar, *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras aw tajrīd asānīd al-kutub al-mashhūra wa-l-ajzāʾ al-manshūra* (Beirut, 1998)

Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* (Hyderabad, 1326AH)

Ibn Hibbān, Muḥammad, Abū Ḥātim, *Mashāhīr ʿulamāʾ al-amṣār* (al-Manṣūra, 1991)

Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya* (Cairo, 1932-9)

Ibn Khayr, *Fahrāsa* (Beirut, 1998)

Ibn Saʿīd, *al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* (Beirut, 1990)

Ibn Yūnus, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad al-Ṣadafī, Abū Saʿīd, *Taʾrīkh al-Miṣriyyīn* (Beirut, 2000)

John of Nikiu, *Chronicle*, ed. R. Charles, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu: translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text* (London, 1916)

Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, *Taʾrīkh* (Beirut, 1397 AH)

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* (Beirut, 2002)

al-Kindī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, Abū ʿUmar, *Kitāb al-wulāt wa-kitāb al-quḍāt*, ed. R. Guest, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt* (Leiden, 1912)

al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-l-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-l-āthār* (Beirut, 1418 AH)

al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl* (Beirut, 1980)

Mughulṭāy, *Ikmāl tahdhīb al-kamāl* (Cairo, 2001)

Muḥammad b. Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh, *Barnāmaj* (Beirut, 1980)

al-Nasāʾī, Aḥmad b. Shuʿayb, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Tasmiyat mashāyikh al-Nasāʾī* (Mecca, 1423 AH)

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-ʿAlāʾī, *Jāmiʿ al-taḥṣīl* (Beirut, 1986).

al-Sūdūnī, Qāsim b. Quṭlūbaghā, *al-Thiqāt mimman lam yaqīʿ fī -l-kutub al-sitta* (Ṣanʿāʾ, 2011)

al-Suyūṭī, *Asmāʾ al-mudallisīn* (Beirut, 1992)

al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-muḥāḍara fī taʾrīkh Miṣr* (Miṣr, 1967)

al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk* (Beirut, 1387 AH)

al-Ṭaḥāwī, *Sharḥ mushkil al-āthār* (Beirut, 1994)

Theophanes Continuatus, ed. M. Featherstone and J. Signes-Codoner, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati Nomine Fertur Libri I-IV* (Berlin, 2015)

Wakīʿ, *Akhbār al-Quḍāt* (Cairo, 1947-50)

al-Wāqidī, *al-Maghāzī* (Beirut, 1989)

The Winchcombe and Coventry chronicles : hitherto unnoticed witnesses to the work of John of Worcester, ed. and tr. P. Hayward (Tempe, 2010).

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-buldān* (Beirut, 1995)

Printed Secondary Works

N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri* (Chicago, 1957)

A. Ahmed, B. Sadeghi, and M. Bonner (eds.), *The Islamic scholarly tradition: Studies in history, law, and thought in honor of Professor Michael Allan Cook* (Leiden, 2011)

S. Anthony, 'Was Ibn Wāḍiḥ al-Yaʿqūbī a Shīʿite historian: The state of the question', *al-ʿUṣūr al-Wuṣṭā* 24 (2016), pp. 15-41

A. Atassi, 'The Transmission of Ibn Saʿd's Biographical Dictionary *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*,' *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 12 (2012), pp. 56-80

A. Atiya, 'Ḳibt', in P. Bearman *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition* (Brill Online, 2012)

D. Ayalon, 'The military reforms of caliph al-Muʿtaṣim: Their background and consequences', in his, *Islam and the abode of war* (Aldershot, 1994)

S. M. Ayyad, 'Regional Literature: Egypt', in J. Ashtiany *et al.* (eds.), *Abbasid Belles Lettres* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 412-41

R. Bagnall (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700* (Cambridge, 2007)

R. Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in his *Image, music, text* (London, 1977), pp. 142-8

S. Bashear, *Arabs and Others in Early Islam* (Princeton, 1997)

D. Beaumont, 'Hard-boiled: Narrative discourse in early Muslim traditions', *Studia Islamica* 83 (1996), pp. 5-31

M. Bernards and J. Nawas, *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam* (Leiden, 2005)

- K. van Bladel, 'The Alexander Legend in the Qurʾān 18:83-102', in D. Reynolds, *The Qurʾān in Its Historical Context* (Abingdon, 2008), pp. 175-203
- J. Blecher, 'Revision in the Manuscript Age: New Evidence of Early Versions of Ibn Ḥajar's *Fath al-bārī*', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 76 (2017), pp. 39-51
- I. Bligh-Abramski, 'The Judiciary (Qāḍīs) as a Governmental-Administrative Tool in Early Islam', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 35 (1992), pp.40-71
- Nicolet Boekhoff-Van Der Voort, Kees Versteegh, and Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam* (Leiden, 2011)
- P. Booth, 'The Muslim Conquest of Egypt Reconsidered', *Travaux et Mémoires* 17 (2013), pp. 639-70
- P. Booth, *Crisis of empire: Doctrine and dissent at the end of late antiquity* (Berkley, London, 2014)
- A. Borrut and P. Cobb (eds.), *Umayyad legacies: Medieval memories from Syria to Spain* (Leiden, 2010)
- A. Borrut, *Entre memoire et pouvoir: L'espace syrien sous les derniers Omeyyades et les premiers Abbassides* (v. 72-193/692-809) (Leiden, 2011)
- A. Borrut and F. Donner (eds.), *Christians and others in the Umayyad state* (Chicago, 2016)
- J. Bray, 'Literary Approaches to Medieval and Early Modern Arabic Biography', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 20 (2010), pp. 237-253
- M. Brett, 'Egypt', in C. Robinson (ed.) *New Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 1 (Cambridge 2010), pp. 541-580
- M. Breydy, 'La Conquête arabe de l'Égypte: un fragment du traditionniste Uthman ibn Salih (144-219 A.H.=761-834 A.D.) identifié dans les Annales d'Eutychios d'Alexandrie (877-940 A.D.)', *Parole de l'Orient*, 8 (1977-8), pp. 379-96
- M. Breydy, *Études sur Saʿīd ibn Batriq et ses sources* (Louvain, 1983)
- J. Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and his Major Compendium of Jurisprudence* (Leiden, 2000)
- J. Brockopp, 'The Minor Compendium of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 214/829) and its reception in the early Mālikī school', *Islamic Law and Society* 12 (2005), pp. 149-81
- J. Brockopp, 'The Formation of Islamic Law: The Egyptian School 750-900', *Annales Islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 123-40
- J. Brown, *The canonization of al-Bukhārī and Muslim : the formation and function of the Sunnī Ḥadīth canon* (Leiden, 2007).
- J. Brown, *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (London, 2009)

- R. Brubaker, *Ethnicity without groups* (Cambridge, Mass., London, 2004)
- R. Brunschvig, 'Ibn Abdelḥakam and the Conquest of North Africa', in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 189-228, originally published as 'Ibn Abdelḥakam et la conquête de l'Afrique du Nord', *Annales de l'Institut d'Études Orientales* 6 (University of Algiers, 1942-7), pp. 108-55
- R. Brunschvig, 'Polémiques médiévales autour du rite de Mālik', *al-Andalus* (1950)
- R. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979)
- A. Busine, 'The Conquest of the Past. Christian Attitudes towards Civic History', in David Engels and Peter Van Nuffeln (eds.), *Religion and Competition in Antiquity* (Brussels, 2014), pp. 220-36.
- A. Butler, *The Arab conquest of Egypt and the last thirty years of the Roman dominion* (Oxford, 1978)
- N. El-Cheikh, 'Muḥammad and Heraclius: A study in legitimacy', *Studia Islamica* 89 (1999), pp. 5-21
- A. Chrysostomides, "'There is no god but God": Islamisation and Religious Code Switching, eighth to tenth centuries', in A. Peacock (ed.), *Islamisation: Comparative perspectives from history* (Edinburgh, 2017), pp. 118-33
- N. Clarke, *The Muslim Conquest of Iberia: Medieval Arabic narratives* (London, 2012)
- P. Cobb, *White Banners: Contention in 'Abbasid Syria 750-880* (New York, 2001)
- P. Cobb, 'Virtual Sacrality: making Muslim Syria sacred before the crusades', *Medieval Encounters* 8.1 (2002), pp. 35-55
- M. Cook, 'Pharonic History in Medieval Egypt', *Studia Islamica* 57 (1983), pp. 67-103
- M. Cook, 'The opponents of the writing of tradition in early Islam', *Arabica* XLIV (1997), pp. 437-530
- M. Cooperson, *Classical Arabic biography: The heirs of the prophets in the age of al-Ma'mūn* (Cambridge, 2000)
- M. Cooperson, 'Biographical writing', in R. Irwin (ed.) *New Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 4 (Cambridge 2010), pp. 458-73
- P. Crone and M. Cook, *Hagarism: the making of the Islamic World* (Cambridge, 1977)
- P. Crone, *Slaves on Horses* (Cambridge, 1980)
- P. Crone and M. Hinds, *God's Caliph: Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam* (Cambridge, 1986)

- P. Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law : the origins of the Islamic patronate* (Cambridge, 1987)
- P. Crone, 'Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period Political Parties?', in *Der Islam* 71 (1994), pp. 1-57
- J. Culler, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2011)
- S. Davis, *The Early Coptic Papacy: The Egyptian Church and Its Leadership in Late Antiquity* (Cairo, 2004)
- M. Debié, 'Syriac Historiography and Identity Formation', *Church History and Religious Culture* 89, pp. 93-114
- F. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: the beginnings of Islamic historical writing* (Princeton, 1998)
- F. Donner, 'Uthmān and the Rāshidūn Caliphs in Ibn 'Asākir's Ta'rikh Madīnat Dimashq: A study in the strategies of compilation', in Lindsay (ed.), *Ibn 'Asākir and Early Islamic History* (Princeton, 2001), pp. 44-61
- F. Doufekar-Aerts, 'A Legacy of the *Alexander Romance* in Arab Writings: Al-Iskandar, Founder of Alexandria', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (London, 1994), pp. 323-43
- R. Drory, 'The Abbasid construction of the Jahiliyya: Cultural authority in the making', *Studia Islamica* 83 (1996), pp. 33-49
- A. Duri, *The Rise of Historical Writing Amongst the Arabs* (Princeton, 1983)
- A. Elad, 'The Beginnings of Historical Writing by the Arabs: The Earliest Syrian Writers on the Arab Conquests.' *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*. Vol. XXVIII (2003), pp. 65-152
- Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition online (2012)
- M. Fierro, 'Local and Global in Ḥadīth Literature: The Case of al-Andalus', in Nicolet Boekhoff-Van Der Voort, Kees Versteegh, and Joas Wagemakers, 'Introduction', in their (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 63-89
- G. Fowden, *Qusayr 'Amra: Art and the Umayyad Elite in Late Antique Syria* (London, 2004)
- G. Frantz-Murphy, 'Land Tenure and Social Transformation in Early Islamic Egypt', in Tarif Khalidi (ed.), *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East* (Beirut, 1984), pp. 131-40
- G. Frantz-Murphy, 'Conversion in Early Islamic Egypt: the economic factor', in Hoyland (ed.), *Muslims and Others in Early Islamic Society* (Ashgate, 2004)
- E. Gad, 'al-Ṭabarī's Tales of Alexander: History and Romance', in R. Stoneman, K. Erickson, and I. Netton (eds.), *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East* (Groningen, 2012), pp. 219-32

- A. Görke, 'Prospects and limits in the study of the historical Muḥammad', in Nicolet Boekhoff-Van Der Voort, Kees Versteegh, and Joas Wagemakers, 'Introduction', in their (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 137-51
- A. Görke, H. Motzki, and G. Schoeler, 'First Century Sources for the Life of Muḥammad? A Debate', *Islam* 89 (2012), pp. 2-59
- I. Goldfeld, 'The *Tafsīr* of 'Abdallāh b. 'Abbās', *Der Islam* 58 (1981), pp. 125-35
- S. Goldman, Joseph, in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān* (Brill Online, 2012)
- M. Gordon, *The breaking of a thousand swords: A history of the Turkish military of Samarra (A.H. 200-275/815-889 C.E.)* (New York, 2001)
- S. Günther, 'Assessing the Sources of Classical Arabic Compilations: The Issue of Categories and Methodologies', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 32 (2005)
- U. Haarmann, 'Regional Sentiment in Medieval Islamic Egypt', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), pp.55-66
- G. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam* (Beckenham, 1986)
- J. den Heijer, *Mawḥūb Ibn Maṣṣūr Ibn Mufarrīḡ et l'historiographie copto-arabe. Étude sur la composition de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie* (Louvain, 1989).
- J. den Heijer, 'La Conquête arabe vue par les historiens coptes', in Christian Décobert (ed.), *Valeur et distance : Identités et sociétés en Égypte* (Paris, 2000)
- J. den Heijer and P. Pilette, 'Transmission et diffusion de l'historiographie copto-arabe : nouvelles remarques sur les recensions primitive et vulgate de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie', in S. Tovar, J. Monferrer-Sala (eds.), *Cultures in Contact. Transfer of Knowledge in the Mediterranean Context* (Beyrouth, 2013), pp. 93-140
- Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 2000)
- D. Herman, *The Cambridge companion to narrative* (2007)
- M. Hinds and H. Sakkout, 'A letter from the governor of Egypt to the king of Nubia and Muqurra concerning Egyptian-Nubian relations in 141/758', in *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Iḥṣān 'Abbās on his sixtieth birthday* (Beirut, 1981), pp. 209-29
- T. El Hibri, *Parable and Politics in Early Islamic History: The Rashidun Caliphs* (New York, 2010)
- M. Hinds, 'Miḥna', in P. Bearman et al. (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition* (Brill Online, 2012)
- K. Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography: Authors as Actors* (London, 2006).

- J. Howard-Johnston, *East Rome, Sasanian Persia and the end of antiquity: Historiographical and historical studies* (Aldershot, 2006)
- J. Howard-Johnston, *Witnesses to a world crisis : historians and histories of the Middle East in the seventh century* (Oxford, 2010)
- R. Hoyland, 'History, fiction and authorship in the first centuries of Islam', in J. Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam: Muslim horizons* (Abingdon, 2006), pp.16-46
- R. Hoyland, 'New Documentary Texts and the Early Islamic State', *Bulletin of SOAS* 69 (2006), pp. 395-416
- R. Humphreys, 'Qur'ānic Myth and Narrative Structure in Early Islamic Historiography', in F. Clover and R. Humphreys, *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity* (Wisconsin, 1989), pp.271-92
- N. Hurvitz, 'Biographies and Mild Asceticism: A Study of Islamic Moral Imagination', *Studia Islamica* 85 (1997), pp.41-65
- N. Hurvitz, 'Miḥna as Self-Defence', *Studia Islamica* 92 (2001), pp.93-111
- A. Jones, 'Were ancient heresies national or social movements in disguise?', *Journal of Theological Studies* X (1959), pp. 280-98
- J. Juda, 'The Economic Status of the Mawālī in Early Islam', in M. Bernards and J. Nawas (eds.), *Patronage and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, pp. 263-77
- G. Juynboll, '(Re)appraisal of Some Technical Terms in Ḥadīth Science', *Islamic Law and Society* 8 (2001), pp. 303-49
- H. Keaney, *Medieval Islamic Historiography: Remembering Rebellion* (London, 2013)
- H. Kennedy, 'Central Government and Provincial Elites in the Early 'Abbāsīd Caliphate', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 44 (1981), pp. 26-38
- H. Kennedy, 'Egypt as a province in the Islamic caliphate, 641-868', in M. Daly (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Egypt* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 62-85
- H. Kennedy, 'Caliphs and their chroniclers in the middle Abbasid period (third/ninth century)', in Chase Robinson (ed.), *Texts, documents and artefacts: Islamic studies in honour of D.S. Richards* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 17-36.
- H. Kennedy, 'The Sources of al-Ṭabarī's History of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate', in H. Kennedy (ed.), *Al-Ṭabarī: A medieval Muslim historian and his work* (Princeton, 2008), pp. 175-85
- N. Khalek, *Damascus after the Muslim conquest: Text and image in early Islam* (Oxford, 2011)

N. Khalek, 'He was tall and slender, and his virtues were numerous': Byzantine hagiographical topoi and the companions of Muhammad in al-Azdi's *Futuh al-Sham*', in A. Papaconstantinou (ed.), *Writing 'True Stories': Historians and Hagiographers in the Late Antique and Medieval Near East* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 104-23

T. Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (Cambridge, 1994)

R. Khoury, 'Al-Layth Ibn Sa'd (94/713-175/791), grand maître et mécène de l'Égypte, vu à travers quelques documents islamiques anciens', *JNES* 40 (1981), pp. 189-202.

R. Khoury, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Lahī'a (97-174/715-790): Juge et grand maître de l'école égyptienne (Wiesbaden, 1986)

M. Klar, 'Stories of the Prophets', in A. Rippin (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Qur'ān* (Oxford, 2006)

W. Kubiak, *al-Fustat: Its foundation and early development* (Cairo, New York, 1987)

A. Kudelin, 'Al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya by Ibn Ishāq – Ibn Hishām: The History of the Texts and the Problems of Authorship', *Manuscripta Orientalia* 16 (2010), pp. 6-12.

L. Lampert-Weissig, *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (Edinburgh, 2010)

E. Landau-Tasseron, 'Alliances in Islam', in M. Bernards and J. Nawas, *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam* (Leiden, 2005), pp. 1-49

M. Lecker, 'Biographical Notes on Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri', *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 41/1 (1996), pp. 21-63.

S. Leder, 'Features of the Novel in Early Historiography: The Downfall of Xālid al-Qasrī', *Oriens* 32 (1990), pp. 2-96

S. Leder, 'The Literary Use of the *Khabar*: A Basic Form of Historical Writing', in Cameron and Conrad (eds.), *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, I, Problems in the Literary Source Material* (Princeton, 1992), pp. 277-315

S. Leder, 'Conventions of fictional narration in learned literature', in his (ed.) *Story-telling in the framework of non-fictional Arabic literature* (Wiesbaden, 1998), 34-60

Stefan Leder (ed.), *Story-telling in the framework of non-fictional Arabic literature* (Wiesbaden, 1998).

S. Leder, 'Heraklios erkennt den Propheten: Ein Beispiel für Form und Entstehungsweise narrativer Geschichtskonstruktionen', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 151 (2001), pp. 1-42.

J. Lindsay, *Ibn 'Asākir and early Islamic history* (Princeton, 2001)

W. Madelung, 'The Origins of the Controversy Concerning the Creation of the Koran', in his, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam* (London, 1985), ch. V

- M. Makkī, 'Egypt and the Origins of Arabic Spanish Historiography: A Contribution to the Study of the Earliest Sources for the History of Islamic Spain', in M. Fierro and J. Samsó (eds.), *The formation of al-Andalus, Part 2: Languages, regions, culture and the sciences* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 173-233
- A. Mazor, 'The *Kitāb futūḥ al-Shām* of al-Qudāmi as a case study for the transmission of traditions about the conquest of Syria', *Der Islam* (2007), pp. 17-45.
- J. McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, online edition (2001-6)
- C. Melchert, *The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 9th-10th Centuries C.E.* (Leiden, 1997)
- M. Mikhail, *From Byzantine to Islamic Egypt: Religion, Identity and Politics after the Arab Conquest* (London, 2014)
- U. Mitter, 'Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronage', in M. Bernards and J. Nawas (eds.), *Patronage and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, pp. 70-133
- K. Morimoto, 'Muslim controversies regarding the conquest of Egypt', *Orient* 13 (1977), pp. 89-105
- K. Morimoto, *The fiscal administration of Egypt in the early Islamic period* (Kyoto, 1981)
- H. Motzki, 'The Collection of the Qur'an: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments', in *Der Islam* 78 (2001), pp. 1-34
- H. Motzki, 'The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: The case of 'Abd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*', in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003), pp. 171-202
- S. Mourad, 'On Early Islamic Historiography: Abu Isma'il al-Azdi and his *Futuh al-Sham*', in *JAOS* 120 (2000), pp. 577-93
- J. Nawas, 'A Reexamination of Three Current Explanations for al-Ma'mun's Introduction of the *Mihna*', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (1994), pp. 615-29
- J. Nawas, 'The *Mihna* of 218 A. H./833 A. D. Revisited: An Empirical Study', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996), pp. 698-708
- H. Norris, 'Fables and legends', in J. Ashtiany et al (eds.), *Abbasid Belles Lettres*, pp. 136-45.
- A. Noth, 'Some remarks on the 'nationalization of conquered lands at the time of the Umayyads', in Tarif Khalidi (ed.), *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East* (Beirut, 1984), pp. 223-8
- A. Noth, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: a source-critical study* (Princeton, 1994)
- A. Noth, 'On the Relationship in the Caliphate between Central Power and the Provinces: The 'Ṣulḥ'-'Anwa' Traditions for Egypt and Iraq', in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 177-88

- A. Papaconstantinou, 'Historiography, Hagiography, and the Making of the Coptic "Church of the Martyrs" in Early Islamic Egypt', in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 60 (2006), pp. 65-86
- A. Papaconstantinou, "They shall speak the Arabic language and take pride in it": reconsidering the fate of Coptic after the Arab conquests', *Le Museon* 120 (2007), pp. 273-99
- A. Papaconstantinou, 'Between *Umma* and *Dhimma*: The Christians of the Middle East under the Umayyads', *Annales Islamologiques* 48 (2008), pp. 127-56
- A. Papaconstantinou, "'What remains behind": Hellenism and Romanitas in Christian Egypt after the Arab conquest', in H. Cotton et al. (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 447-66
- Papaconstantinou, 'Administering the Early Islamic Empire: Insights from the Papyri', in John Haldon (ed.), *Money, Power and Politics in Early Islamic Syria: A review of current debates* (Farnham, 2010)
- R. Paret, 'The Legendary *Futūḥ* Literature', reprinted in F. Donner (ed.), *The Expansion of the Early Islamic State* (Aldershot, 2008), pp.163-75
- D. Pipes, 'Mawlas: freed slaves and converts in early Islam', in R. Hoyland (ed.), *Muslims and Others in Early Islamic Society* (Ashgate, 2004), pp. 277-322
- J. Porter, 'Pre-Islamic Arabic Historical Traditions and the Early Historical Narratives of the Old Testament', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 87 (1986), pp. 17-26
- W. al-Qadi, 'Biographical Dictionaries: Inner Structure and Cultural Significance', in G. Atiyeh, *The Book in the Islamic World* (New York), pp. 93-122
- W. al-Qadi, 'Biographical Dictionaries as the Scholars' Alternative History of the Muslim Community', in G. Endress (ed.), *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopaedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 23-76
- W. al-Qāḍī, 'In the Footsteps of Arabic Biographical Literature: A Journey, Unfinished, in the Company of Knowledge', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 68 (2009), pp. 241-52
- G. Reinink, 'Heraclius, the New Alexander. Apocalyptic Prophecies during the Reign of Heraclius', in G. Reinink and B. Stolte (eds.), *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation* (Leuven, 2002), pp. 81-94.
- G. Reinink, 'Alexander the Great in Seventh-Century Syriac 'Apocalyptic' Texts', *Byzantinorossika* (2003), pp. 150-78.
- Andrew Rippin, 'Tafsīr Ibn 'Abbās and criteria for dating early tafsīr texts', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 18 (1994), pp. 38-83
- A. Rippin, 'Studying early tafsīr texts', *Der Islam* 72 (1995), pp.310-23

- A. Rippin, 'Tafsīr', *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition* (Brill Online, 2012)
- C. Robinson, *Empire and elites after the Muslim conquest : the transformation of northern Mesopotamia* (Cambridge, 2000)
- C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge, 2003)
- F. Rosenthal, 'Ibn 'Abdal-Ḥakam', in P. Bearman et al. (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition* (Brill Online, 2012)
- S. Savant, 'Forgetting Ctesiphon: Iran's Pre-Islamic Past, ca. 800-1100', in P. Wood (ed.), *History and Identity in the late antique east, 500-1000* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 169-186
- A. El Shamsy, *The canonization of Islamic law: A social and intellectual history* (Cambridge, 2013)
- A. Shboul, *Al-Mas'ūdī & his world : a Muslim humanist and his interest in non-Muslims* (London, 1979)
- J. Scheiner, *Die Eroberung von Damaskus: Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zur Historiographie in klassisch-islamischer Zeit* (Leiden, Boston, 2010)
- J. Scheiner, 'The conquest of Damascus according to the oldest datable sources', in Nicolet Boekhoff-Van Der Voort, Kees Versteegh, and Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 153-80
- J. Scheiner, 'Single Isnāds or Riwāyas? Quoted Books in Ibn 'Asākir's *Tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī', in M. Pomerantz and A. Shahin (eds.), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 42-72
- G. Schoeler, *The oral and the written in early Islam* (London, New York, 2006)
- G. Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: from the aural to the read* (Edinburgh, 2009)
- B. Shoshan, *Poetics of Islamic historiography: Deconstructing Ṭabarī's history* (Leiden, 2004)
- B. Shoshan, *The Arabic historical tradition and the early Islamic conquests: Folklore, tribal lore, holy war* (London, 2016)
- P. Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the beginning of Muslim rule', in Bagnall (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700* (Cambridge, 2007)
- P. Sijpesteijn, 'Building an Egyptian Identity', in A. Ahmed, M. Bonner, B. Sadeghi (eds.), *Scholars and Scholarship of the Islamic World* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 97-123
- P. Sijpesteijn, *Shaping a Muslim State: The World of a Mid-Eighth Century Official* (Oxford, 2013)
- T. Sizgorich, 'Narrative and Community in Islamic Late Antiquity', *Past and Present* 185 (2004), pp. 9-42

- T. Sizgorich, *Violence and belief in late antiquity: Militant devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia, 2009)
- T. Sizgorich, 'Mind the gap: Accidental conversion and the hagiographic imaginary in the first centuries A.H.', in A. Papaconstantinou et al (eds.), *Conversion in late antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and beyond* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 163-74
- G. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, London, 1997)
- R. Stoneman, 'Alexander the Great in the Arabic Tradition', in *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 3-21
- H. Suermann, 'Copts and the Islam of the Seventh Century', in E. Grypeou et al (eds.), *The Encounter of Eastern Christianity with Islam* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 95-109
- M. Tillier, 'Les « premiers » cadis de Fustāṭ et les dynamiques régionales de l'innovation judiciaire (750-833)', *Annales islamologiques* 45 (2011), pp. 213-242
- M. Tillier, 'Scribes et enquêteurs: Note sur le personnel judiciaire en Égypte aux quatre premiers siècles de l'hégire', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 54 (2011), pp. 370-404.
- M. Tillier, *L'invention du cadi : la justice des musulmans, des Juifs et des chrétiens aux premiers siècles de l'Islam* (Paris, 2017)
- R. Tottoli, *Biblical Prophets in the Qur'ān and Muslim Literature* (Richmond, 2002)
- W. Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke, 2013)
- N. Tsafir, *The History of an Islamic School of Law: The Early Spread of Hanafism* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004)
- J. Wansbrough, *Quranic studies : sources and methods of scriptural interpretation* (Oxford, 1977)
- J. Wansbrough, *The sectarian milieu : content and composition of Islamic salvation history* (Oxford, 1978)
- W. Watt, 'The Materials used by Ibn Ishāq', in Bernard Lewis and P. Holt (eds.), *Historians of the Middle East* (London, 1962), pp. 23-34
- P. Webb, 'Al-Jāhiliyya: Uncertain times of uncertain meanings', *Der Islam* 91 (2014), pp. 69-94
- P. Webb, 'Pre-Islamic *al-Shām* in Classical Arabic Literature', *Studia Islamica* 110 (2015), pp. 135-64
- P. Webb, *Imagining the Arabs : Arab identity and the rise of Islam* (Edinburgh, 2016)
- J. Weststeijn, 'Tyrant dreamers face Abrahamite interpreters: A recurring motif in al-Ṭabarī's *History*', in M. Bernards (ed.), *Abbāsid studies IV* (Warminster, 2013), pp. 98-129

B. Wheeler, 'Moses or Alexander? Early Islamic Exegesis of Qur'ān 18:60-65', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998), pp. 191-215

C. Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2005)

al-Ziriklī, *al-A'lām* (15th edition, 2015)

Unpublished Theses

S. Bouderbala, 'Ğund Mişr : étude de l'administration militaire dans l'Égypte des débuts de l'Islam 21/642 – 218/833' (Univ. Paris Ph.D. thesis, 2008)

M. Dunn, 'The Struggle for 'Abbāsīd Egypt' (Georgetown University Ph.D. thesis, 1975)

S. Gellens, 'Scholars and Travellers: The Social History of Early Muslim Egypt, 218-487/833-1094' (Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 1986)

Y. Hilloowala, 'The history of the conquest of Egypt, being a partial translation of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's *Futuh Misr* and an analysis of this translation' (University of Arizona Ph.D. thesis, 1998)

M. Legendre, 'La Moyenne-Égypte du VII^e au IX^e siècle: Apports d'une perspective régionale à l'étude d'une société entre Byzance et l'Islam' (University of Paris-Sorbonne Ph.D. thesis, 2014)

Tamer el-Leithy, 'Coptic culture and conversion in medieval Cairo, 1293–1524 A.D.' (Princeton University Ph.D. thesis, 2005)

R. Lynch, 'Between the conquests and the court : a critical analysis of the Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān of al-Balādhurī' (University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2016)

F. Martinez, 'Eastern Christian apocalyptic in the early Muslim period: Pseudo-Methodius and Pseudo-Athanasius' (Catholic University of America Ph.D. thesis, 1985)

F. Salem, 'Ibn al-Mubārak between *ḥadīth*, *jihād*, and *zuhd*' (University of Chicago PhD thesis, 2013)

S. al-Samuk, 'Die historischen Überlieferungen nach Ibn Isḥāq. Eine synoptische Untersuchen' (University of Frankfurt Ph.D. thesis, 1978)

A. El Shamsy, 'From Tradition to Law: The Origins and Development of the Shāfi'ī School in Ninth-Century Egypt' (Harvard Ph.D. thesis, 2009)

P. Weinfield, 'The Islamic Alexander: A religious and political theme in Arabic and Persian literature' (Columbia University Ph.D. thesis, 2008)

C. Wright, 'Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's *Futuh Misr*: An Analysis of the Text and New Insights into the Islamic Conquest of Egypt' (University of California Santa Barbara Ph.D. thesis, 2006)

Pag	Trans 1	Trans 2	Trans 3	Trans 4	Trans 5	Trans 6	Trans 7	Trans 8
1	Muhammad b. Isma'il al-Ka'bi	Isma'il al-Ka'bi	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	Abu Qabil	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
2	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Sufyan b. 'Uyayna	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
2	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa	Abu Dharr	Muhammad		
2	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
2	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad		
2	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Malik b. Anas	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
2	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa	Abu Dharr	Muhammad		
2	Ashhab b. 'Abd al-'Aziz	Malik b. Anas	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
2	Hamid b. Yahya	Sufyan b. 'Uyayna	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
2	Muhammad b. Rumh	al-Layth b. Sa'd	al-Zuhri	Ibn Ka'b b. Malik	Muhammad			
3	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Isma'il b. 'Ayyash	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad	Muslim b. Yasar	Muhammad			
3	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Salim al-Jayshani Sufyan b.	Companion	Muhammad		
3	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahm	Muhammad		
3	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Musa b. Ayyub al-Ghafiqi	A Zabadi (?)	Muhammad			
3	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Muhammad			
3	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Muhammad			
3	Sa'id b. Maysara	Ishaq b. Furat	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Aswad b. Malik al-Himyari	Bahir b. Dhakhir al-Ma'afiri	Amr b. al-'As	Umar b. al-Khattab	Muhammad
3	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Salim al-Jayshani Sufyan b.	Companion	Muhammad		
4	Abd Allah b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
4	Abd Allah b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
4	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah	Ibn Ishaq					
4	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Umar mawla of Ghufra	Muhammad			
4	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Muhammad			
4	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Amr/'Umar b. Hurayth	Muhammad			
4	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Muhammad			
4	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Amr b. Hurayth	Muhammad			
4	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
4	Uthman b. Salih	Marwan al-Qassas						
5	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Ka'b al-Ahbar				
5	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Ka'b al-Ahbar				
5	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Tubay'				
5	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Tubay'				

5	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
5	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Khawlani					
5	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
6	Abd Allah b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yahya b. Maymun al-Hadrami	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
6	Abd Allah b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa	Abu Ruhm al-Sama'i			
6	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yahya b. Maymun al-Hadrami	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
6	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa	Abu Ruhm al-Sama'i			
7	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
7	Asad b. Khalid b. 'Abd Allah							
7	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani	Hanash b. 'Abd Allah al-S-n-'-a-	Abd Allah b. 'Abbas			
8	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Sulayman b. Bilal	Yahya b. Sa'id	Sa'id b. Musayyab				
8	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Abd Allah b. Khalid					
8	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Ibn Lahi'a					
8	Uthman b. Salih	Abd Allah b. Khalid						
8	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a						
8	Uthman b. Salih							
8	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yahya b. Sa'id	Sa'id b. Musayyab				
8	Yahya b. Khalid	Abd Allah b. Khalid						
8	Yahya b. Khalid	Ibn Lahi'a						
10	"They"	Ibn Wahb	Jarir b. Hazim	Ayyub	Muhammad b. Sirin	Abu Hurayra	Muhammad	
10	Abu Hurayra							
10	Asad b. Musa	Abd Allah b. Khalid	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas		
10	Asad b. Musa							
10	Asad b. Musa							
11	Abu Hurayra							
11	Asad b. Musa	Isra'il	Abu Ishaq	Haritha b. Mudarrib	Ali b. Abi Talib			
11	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Abi Zinad	His Father	al-A'raj	Abu Hurayra	Muhammad		
12	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham							
12	Uthman b. Salih							
12	Wathima b. Musa	Salama b. al-Fadl and/or 'A	Ibn Ishaq	Abd al-Rahman	Abu Hurayra			
13	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)				
13	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Abu Sa'id	Ikrima				
13	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
13	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Our shaykhs					

13	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)				
13	Uthman b. Salih							
13	Uthman b. Salih							
13	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)				
14	Hisham b. Ishaq							
14	Hisham b. Ishaq							
15	Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
16	Hisham b. Ishaq							
16	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
17	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
17	Hisham b. Ishaq							
17	Hisham b. Ishaq							
18	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Abu Hafs al-Kala'i	Tubay'	Ka'b			
18	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Abu Hafs al-Kala'i	Tubay'	Ka'b			
18	Muhammad b. As'ad	Abu al-Ahwas	Simak b. Harb					
18	Uthman b. Salih							
19	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a and/or al-Layth						
19	al-'Abbas b. Talib	Abd al-Wahid b. Ziyad	Yunus	al-Hasan				
19	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Abu Hafs al-Kala'i	Tubay'	Ka'b			
19	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Abd Allah b. Abi Fatima	His Teachers					
19	Uthman b. Salih							
19	Uthman b. Salih							
20	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Someone	Hani' b. al-Mundhir					
20	Yazid b. Abi Salama	Jarir	Abd al-Malik b. Maysara	al-Nazzal b. Sabra	Abu Bakr al-Siddiq			
21	Muhammad b. As'ad al-Taghlibi	Abu al-Ahwas	Simak b. Harb					
22	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
22	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Whoever told him					
23	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	His Father					
23	Asad b. Musa	al-Mas'udi	Abu Ishaq	Abu 'Ubayda				
23	Asad b. Musa	Isra'il	Abu Ishaq	Amr b. Maymun				
23	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Abu Sa'id	Ikrima				
23	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
23	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
23	Uthman b. Salih							

24	Abd Allah b. Salih	Mu'awiya b. Salih	Ulayy b. Abi Talha	Ibn 'Abbas				
24	Abd al-Rahman b. Zayd b. Aslam							
24	Abu Sahl Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Rahim	Muhammad b. Yusuf	Isra'il	Ibn Abi Najih	Mujahid			
24	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
24	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
24	Hafs b. 'Umar al-'Adani	al-Hakam b. Aban	Ikrima					
24	Someone	Sa'd b. Abi 'Aruba	Qatada	al-Hasan				
24	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu S-kh-r	Muhammad b. Ka'b al-Qurazi				
25	Abu Sa'id	Ikrima						
25	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas			
25	Asad b. Musa	Abu 'Ulayy	Hammad b. Salama	Ata' b. al-Sa'ib	Mujahid			
25	Asad b. Musa	al-Hasan b. Bilal	Hammad b. Salama	Ulayy b. Zayd	Yusuf b. Mihran	Ibn 'Abbas		
26	Amr b. Khalid	Zuhayr b. Mu'awiya	Abu Ishaq					
26	Asad b. Musa	Isra'il	Abu Ishaq	Amr b. Maymun				
26	Uthman b. Salih							
27	Uthman b. Salih							
28	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
29	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	al-Kala'i	Tubay'	Ka'b			
30	Uthman b. Salih							
31	Wathima b. Musa							
32	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Abd al-Rahman b. Ghanam al-Ash'ari				
32	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Qabil					
32	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Abd al-Rahman b. Ghanam al-Ash'ari				
33	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil					
33	Uthman b. Salih							
34	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Uqayl b. Khalid	al-Zuhri				
34	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Uqayl b. Khalid	al-Zuhri	Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Utba b. Mas'ud			
35	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Hiql b. Ziyad	Mu'awiya b. Yahya al-Sadafi	al-Zuhri	Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b.	Ibn 'Abbas		
35	Sa'id b. Talid	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a					
37	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Transmitter from non-Arabs				
37	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham							
37	Wathima b. Musa	Sa'id b. Bashir	Qatada					
38	Ibn Lahi'a							
38	Tubba'							

38	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. An'ul	Sa'd b. Mas'ud al-Tujibi				
39	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Thawr b. Yazid	Khalid b. Ma'dan al-Kala'i			
39	Wathima b. Musa	Sufyan b. 'Uyayna	Ibn Abi Husayn	Abu al-Tufayl	Ali b. Abi Talib			
39	Wathima b. Musa	Someone	Sa'id b. Abi 'Aruba	Qatada	al-Hasan			
40	Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Imran	Khazim b. Husayn	Yunus b. 'Ubayd	al-Hasan				
40	Abd al-'Aziz b. Mansur al-Yahsubi	Asim b. Hakim	Abu Sari' al-Ta'l	Ubayd b. Ti'la				
40	Ahmad b. Muhammad	Abd al-'Aziz b 'Imran	Sulayman b. Asid	al-Zuhri				
40	Shaykhs of Egypt	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Who told him	Abd Allah b. 'Amr b. al-'As			
41	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Qays b. al-Hajjaj	Tubay'				
41	Ibn Lahi'a							
41	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitt	His father ('Ayyash)	Tubay'				
42	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam							
42	Asad b. Musa	Khalid b. 'Abd Allah	Ibn al-Suddi	His father (al-Suddi)				
42	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Abd Allah b. Tarif al-Hamdani						
42	Khalid and Abu Hamza							
42	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	al-'Attaf b. Khalid						
42	Shaykhs							
43	Asad b. Musa	Isra'il	Abu A-s-h-q	Nawf				
43	Asad b. Musa	Isma'il b. 'Ayyash	Hisham b. Sa'd al-Madini					
43	Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bagdh	Da'ud	Uthman b. 'Ata'	His father ('Ata')				
43	Some of the Muhaddithun							
44	Abd Allah b. Salih	Mu'awiya b. Salih	Ali b. Abi Talha	Ibn 'Abbas				
44	Abd al-Rahman							
44	al-Harith b. Miskin	Ibn al-Qasim	Malik b. Anas					
44	Asad - Ibrahim b. Sa'd	Abu al-Huwayrith						
44	Asad b. 'Abd Allah b. Khalid	al-Kalbi	Abu Salih	Ibn 'Abbas				
44	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
45	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Wahb	Yunus b. Yazid	al-Zuhri	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Qari			
45	Hisham b. Ishaq							
45	Hisham b. Ishaq							
46	Abd Allah b. Sa'id al-Madhhiji	Rabi'a b. 'Uthman	Aban b. Salih					
47	al-Nadr b. Salama al-Sami	Hatim b. Isma'il	Usama b. Zayd al-Laythi	al-Mundhir b. 'Ubayd	Abd al-Rahman b. Hassan b. Sirin			
47	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Wahb	Yunus b. Yazid	al-Zuhri	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Qari			
47	Hisham b. Ishaq							

48	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Ya'qub b. 'Utba				
48	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
49	Ahmad b. Sa'id al-Fihri	Marwan b. Yahya al-Hatibi	Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. Y	Abd al-Rahman b. Hatib	Hatib b. Abi Balta'a			
49	Duhaym 'Abd al-Rahman b. Ibrahim	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	al-Zuhri	Anas		
49	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Ibn 'Amr			
50	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Muslim b. Khalid al-Zanji	Abd Allah b. 'Uthman b. Khutha	Shahr b. Hawshab	Asma' bt. Yazid			
50	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Hafs b. Sulayman	Kathir b. Shinzir	Abu Nadra al-Mundhir b. Malik	Abu Sa'id al-Khudri			
50	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Quraysh b. Hayyan	Thabit b. Bunani	Anas b. Malik				
50	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
51	Ali b. Ma'bad	Isa b. Yunus	Muhammad b. Abi Layla	Ata' b. Abi Rabah	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah			
51	al-Nadr b. Salama al-Sami	Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Hatim b. Isma'il	Usama b. Zayd	al-Mundhir b. 'Ubayd	Abd al-Rahman b. Sirin		
51	Duhaym	Marwan b. Mu'awiya	Isra'il	Ziyad b. 'Alaqa (sp)	al-Mughira b. Shu'ba			
52	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-A'raj					
52	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Qasim b. 'Abd Allah	Ubayd Allah b. 'Umar	al-thiqa	Ibn Mas'ud			
52	Ali b. Ma'bad	Isa b. Yunus	al-A'mash	Someone	al-Bara' b. 'Azib			
52	al-Qa'nabi	Husayn b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Uba	Ikrima	Ibn 'Abbas				
52	Habi' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
52	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
52	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	Musa b. Da'ud	Sallam	Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-Rahman	al-Hasan al-'Urani	Ash'ath b. Taliq	Murra b. al-Mutallib /	Abd Allah b. Ma
52	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a						
52	Yazid b. Abi Habib							
52	Yazid b. Abi Salama	Abd al-Wahid b. Ziyad	al-Hajjaj b. Artat	Abu Bakr b. 'Amr	Yazid b. al-Bara'	al-Bara' (b. 'Azib?)		
53	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham							
53	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Isma'il b. 'Ayyash	Abu Bakr b. Abi Maryam	Rashid b. Sa'd				
53	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah al-Lakhmi				
53	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama b. Jabr							
53	Uthman b. Salih							
53	Wathima b. Musa							
53	Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi	Ibn Lahi'a	Khalid b. Yazid					
53	Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi	Yahya b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid					
55	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
55	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
55	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani					
55	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far					

55	Uthman b. Salih						
57	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
57	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
57	Yahya b. Khalid	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
58	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
58	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Abu Shurayh 'Abd al-Rahma	Abd al-Karim b. al-Harith				
58	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
58	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
58	Uthman b. Salih						
59	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Sharahil b. Yazid	Abu al-Husayn	Lakhmi	Kurayb b. Abraha
59	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Sharahil b. Yazid	Abu al-Husayn	Lakhmi	
59	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Sharahil b. Yazid	Abu al-Husayn	Lakhmi	
59	Uthman b. Salih						
59	Uthman b. Salih						
60	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
60	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
60	Ibn Wahb						
60	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas				
60	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far				
61	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib			
61	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib			
61	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
61	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	al-Layth b. Sa'd				
62	Isa b. Hammad						
62	Shaykh from ahl misr						
62	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a					
63	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Shayban b. Umayya	Ruwayfi' b. Thabit	
63	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Abu Salim al-Jayshani	Ibn 'Amr			
63	Hisham b. Ishaq						
63	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
63	Uthman b. Salih						
63	Uthman b. Salih						
64	Shaykhs of Egypt						
64	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	al-Layth b. Sa'd				

64	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
64	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
65	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
65	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
66	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
66	Uthman b. Salih							
70	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
70	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yayhya b. Maymun al-Hadrami					
70	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
70	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
72	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
72	Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
73	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
73	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
73	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
73	Uthman b. Salih							
74	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Shaykh				
74	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Shaykh				
74	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Khawlani					
74	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
74	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
74	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
74	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
74	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
75	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Iskandarani						
76	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
76	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid					
76	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
76	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
76	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
76	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in			
76	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
77	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Ayyash b. 'Abbas					
77	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Musa b. 'Ulayy					

77	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
77	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	al-thiqa				
78	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
79	Uthman b. Salih	Someone					
79	Yahya b. Khalid	Abd al-Rahman b. Zayd b. A	Zayd b. Aslam				
80	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
80	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
80	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Malik b. Anas					
80	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah	Busr b. Sa'id	Junada b. Abi Umayya		
80	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri					
80	Ibn Lahi'a						
80	Ibrahim b. Sa'id al-Balawi						
80	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in		
80	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in		
81	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Musa b. 'Ulayy	His father ('Ulayy)	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj			
81	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a					
82	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil				
82	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Musa b. Ayyub	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd			
82	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Rishdin b. Sa'd	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd			
82	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Muhammad b. Sa'id al-Hashimi					
82	Ibrahim b. Sa'id al-Balawi						
82	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Miqlas	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Da'ud	Haywa b. Shurayh			
83	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
83	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Awf b. Hittan		
83	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Awf b. Hittan		
83	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
83	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in		
83	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
84	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Musa b. Ayyub	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd			
84	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Rishdin b. Sa'd	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd			
84	Uthman b. Salih	al-Layth	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
85	Abd Allah b. Salih	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far				
85	Hisham b. Ishaq	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far				
85	Uthman b. Salih	Bakr b. Mudar	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Someone	Amr b. al-'As		

85	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Jum'a mawla of 'Uqba (Habib b. Wahb?)			
86	Abd Allah b. Salih	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far				
86	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Abu Jum'a Habib b. Wahb		
86	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Yahya b. Maymun al-Hadrami			
86	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
86	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Awf b. Hittan			
86	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
87	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Hasan b. Thawban al-Hamda	Hisham b. Abi Ruqayya al-Lakhmi		
87	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Khalid b. Humayd	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in		
87	Uthman b. Salih	Khalid b. N-j-y-h	Yayha b. Ayyub	Khalid b. Yazid	Tabi'in		
87	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
88	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i				
88	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. An'am	His father (Ziyad b. An'am)	His father (An'am)		
88	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Someone	Ubayd Allah b. Mughira b. Al	Sufyan b. Wahb al-Khawlani	
88	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama						
88	Ibn Lahi'a	Yahya b. Maymun	Ubayd Allah b. Mughira	Sufyan b. Wahb			
88	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i				
88	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. An'am				
88	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Someone	Ubayd Allah b. Mughira b. Al	Sufyan b. Wahb al-Khawlani	
89	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-Malik b. Junada, scribe of Hayyan b. Shurayj				
89	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Ya'qub b. Mujahid	Zayd b. Aslam		
89	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qanan Ayyub b. Abi al-'Ali	His father (Abu al-'Aliya)			
89	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Da'ud b. 'Abd Allah al-Hadrami	Abu Qanan (Ayyub b. Abi al-'Ali)	His father (Abu al-'Aliya)		
89	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Iyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Fihri	Rabi'a b. Abi 'Abd al-Rahman			
89	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-Malik b. Junada, scribe of Hayyan b. Shurayj				
89	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
90	Abd Allah b. Salih	Yahya b. Ayyub	Abd al-Rahman b. Ka'b b. Abi Lubaba				
90	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	The scribe of Hayyan ('Abd al-Malik b. Junada)		
90	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Salt b. Abi 'Asim				
90	Abd al-Rahman	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib			
90	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Amr b. Shu'ayb	His father (Shu'ayb)	His father (?)		
90	Yahya b. Khalid	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Uqayl b. Khalid	al-Zuhri			
91	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
91	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				

91	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
91	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
91	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib			
91	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
92	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani				
92	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Yahya b. Azhar	al-Hajjaj b. Shaddad	Abu Salih Sa'id b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Ghifari		
92	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr			
92	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
92	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama						
92	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Ibn Wahb	Yunus b. Yazid	al-Zuhri	Salim b. 'Abd Allah		
92	Ibn Lahi'a						
93	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
93	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama and others						
93	They	Waki'	Musa b. 'Ulayy	His father ('Ulayy)			
94	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
94	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham						
94	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
94	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Aslam Abu 'Imran	Hubayb b. Mughfil			
94	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
94	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
95	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
95	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
95	Amr b. Sawwad	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Sa'id b. Abi Sh-m-r al-Saba'i	Sufyan b. Wahb		
95	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
95	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. Mubarak	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah		
96	Abd al-Hamid b. al-Walid	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman	Mujalid	al-Sha'bi			
96	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu 'Ushana	Abu Yaqzan 'Ammar b. Yasir			
96	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
97	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Musa b. 'Ulayy				
97	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy					
97	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani						
97	Amr b. Sawwad	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani		
97	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Amr b. al-'As			
97	Musa b. 'Ulayy	His father ('Ulayy)	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'	Muhammad			

97	Nafi' b. Yazid	al-Harith b. Sa'id al-'Utaqi	Abd Allah b. Munayn of Banu 'A	Amr b. al-'As				
97	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam							
97	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani				
97	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Sab	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani					
98	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik b.	Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Umayya	Qays b. Sa'd			
99	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Musa b. Wardan					
100	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
101	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Fadala b. 'Ubayd				
101	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
101	Ya'qub b. Ishaq b. Abi 'Abbad	Hammad b. Shu'ayb	Mansur	Hilal b. Yasaq				
102	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Razin b. 'Abd Allah				
102	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil					
102	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
102	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
102	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
103	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam							
103	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
104	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
104	al-Layth b. Sa'd							
104	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
105	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Abi Murra al-Zawfi			
105	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Hiql b. Ziyad	Mu'awiya b. Yahya al-Sadafi	al-Zuhri				
105	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Abi Murra al-Zawfi			
105	Mu'awiya b. Salih	Yahya b. Ma'in	Wahb b. Jarir	His father (Jarir)				
105	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Abi Murra al-Zawfi			
107	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham							
107	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Shaykhs of the jund						
108	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Someone	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Udays			
108	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth						
109	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-Mahri				
109	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Abu Dharr			
109	Ibn Wahb	al-Layth						
109	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
110	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					

110	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a						
110	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani	al-Haytham b. Shufayy Abu al-H	Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abi Sarh				
110	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Kathir b. A'raj al-Sadafi	Abu Fatima	Muhammad			
110	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a						
110	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth						
111	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Dahhak b. Shurahbil al-Ghafi	Ammar b. Sa'd al-Tujibi				
111	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
112	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
113	Hamid/Humayd b. Hisham al-Himyari							
113	Harun b. 'Abd Allah al-Zuhri	Muhammad b. 'Umar	Abd al-Hamid b. Ja'far	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
113	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Maymun b. Yahya	Makhrama b. Bukayr	Ya'qub b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Ashajj				
113	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
114	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khalid b. Yazid	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Abu Basra	Muhammad		
114	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
115	Abd Allah b. Salih	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Ibn 'Ayyash al-Qitbani ('Ayyash	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i				
115	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khayr b. Nu'aym	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Abu Basra	Muhammad		
115	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Kulayb b. Dhuhl al-Hadrami	Ubayd b. Jabr				
115	Ibn Lahi'a	Musa b. Wardan	Abu al-Haytham	Abu B-s-ra	Muhammad			
115	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
115	Shaykhs of Egypt							
116	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah	Muhammad b. Ishaq					
116	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
116	al-'Abbas b. Talib	Abd al-Wahid b. Ziyad	Asim al-A-h-w-l	Abu 'Uthman al-N-h-di				
117	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
119	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth						
121	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Tha'laba Abu al-Kanud	Abd Allah b. Malik	Muhammad		
121	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib						
121	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Sadafi	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yahya b. Maymum al-Hadrami	Wada'a(sp?) al-H-m-di	Abu Musa al-Ghafiqi		
121	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Tha'laba Abu al-Kanud	Abd Allah b. Malik	Muhammad		
122	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
122	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
123	Abu Mus'ab al-Balawi							
124	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid					
124	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Utba b. Abi Hakim	al-Zuhri	Muhammad			

125	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Tubay'				
125	Ibn Jidhr al-Ti'an							
126	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Utba b. Abi Hakim	Messenger				
127	Abu Jabir Muhammad b. 'Abd al-M	al-Rukn b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd	MKHWL	Mu'adh				
127	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil	Shufayy b. Mati'				
128	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Messenger				
128	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
128	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
129	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	mawla of Fahm					
129	Ibn Lahi'a							
130	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
130	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
130	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
130	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
131	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
131	Yazid b. Abi Habib							
132	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Shaykhs of Egypt					
132	Hamid/Humayd b. Hisham al-Himyari							
132	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
133	Dirar b. al-Khattab							
133	Muhammad b. Idris al-Razi							
134	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama							
134	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama							
134	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Abd al-A'la b. Abi 'Mra				
137	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Amr b. Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb's father			
137	Yahya b. Khalid	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
138	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
138	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Ibn Sandar	Messenger		
138	Amr b. Shu'ayb							
138	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Abd Allah b. Sandar	Sandar		
138	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Ibn Sandar	Messenger		
138	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
138	Yazid b. Abi Habib							
139	Abd Allah b. Salih	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Abu Qabil					

139	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
139	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
139	Sa'id b. Maysara	Ishaq b. al-Furat	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Aswad b. Malik al-Himyari	Bahir b. Dhakhir al-Ma'afiri	Amr b. al-'As	Umar	Messenger
139	Sa'id b. Maysara	Ishaq b. al-Furat	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Aswad b. Malik al-Himyari	Bahir b. Dhakhir al-Ma'afiri			
143	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj			
143	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa a	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
143	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Qays b. al-Hajjaj					
143	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj			
144	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam							
144	Abd al-Wahid b. Ishaq	Marwan b. Mu'awiya	Abu HYAN al-Taymi	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir	Abu Hurayra			
145	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
145	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
145	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
146	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Khalid b. al-S'Q				
146	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Khalid b. al-S'Q				
146	Mu'awiya b. Salih	Muhammad b. SMA'a al-Ra	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-'Aziz					
147	Mu'awiya b. Salih	Yahya b. Ma'in	Wahb b. Jarir	Jarir	al-Zubayr b. al-KHRYT	al-Mukhtar al-Numayri		
148	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Ja'far b. Rabi'a	Rabi'a				
148	Asad b. Musa	Sulayman b. Abi Sulayman	Muhammad b. Sirin	Abu Hurayra				
149	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Ka'b b. Ahbar			
149	Abd Allah b. Yusuf	Abd Allah b. 'Umar	Habib b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Hafs b. 'Asim	Abu Hurayra			
149	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd Allah b. 'Amr b. al-'As				
149	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
150	Ibn Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Qays b. al-Hajjaj					
150	Sa'Id b. Abi Maryam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Abu Junada al-Kinani	Ka'b al-Ahbar		
150	Sa'Id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Abu Junada al-Kinani	Ka'b al-Ahbar		
151	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Qasim b. 'Abd Allah	Abd Allah b. Dinar	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
151	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Abd Allah b. 'Umar	Nafi'	Aslam mawla of 'Umar b. al-Khattab			
151	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Umar b. Muhammad	Nafi'	Aslam mawla of 'Umar b. al-Khattab			
151	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Nafi'	Aslam mawla of 'Umar b. al-Khattab			
151	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
151	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
152	Abd al-Malik	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
152	Asad b. Musa	Sufyan b. 'Uyayna	Abu Ishaq	Haritha b. Mudarrib	Umar			

153	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Yunus b. Yazid	al-Zuhri				
153	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Hishab b. Abi Ruqayya al-Lakhmi					
154	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-Malik b. Junada, scribe of Hayyan b. Shurayj					
154	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz				
154	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz						
154	al-Layth b. Sa'd							
155	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Muhammad b. 'Amr	Ibn Jurayj				
155	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
155	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Malik b. Anas						
156	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
156	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
156	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Razin b. 'Abd Allah al-Muradi					
156	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
156	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
156	al-Layth b. Sa'd							
156	Uthman b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
157	Abd Allah b. 'BAD	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Fadala					
157	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a						
157	Ibn Lahi'a							
157	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Fadala					
157	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Wahb	MARa b. 'Isa					
157	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a						
157	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a						
158	Abd Allah b. Salih							
158	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil					
158	al-Hasan b. Thawban							
158	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd al-Shufayy b. 'Ubayd				
158	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Rishdin b. Sa'd	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Husayn b. Shufayy b. 'Ubayd al-Shufayy b. 'Ubayd				
160	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Abu Marzuq al-Tujibi	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'As				
161	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
161	al-Layth b. Sa'd							
161	Hisham b. Ishaq							
161	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Zayd b. Aslam	Zayd b. Aslam					
162	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd						

162	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Haywa b. Shurayh	Bakr b. 'Amr	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i		
162	Ibn Wahb	Sharik b. 'Abd al-Rahman al	Sharik b. Sumayy al-Ghutayfi				
164	Abd al-Hakam b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman			
165	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Sufyan b. 'Uyayna	Ibn Abi Najih	Abu Najih			
165	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Hisham b. Sa'd	Zayd b. Aslam	Aslam		
166	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Malik b. Anas	Nafi'				
166	Asad b. Musa	Waki' b. al-Jarrah	Hisham b. Sa'd	Zayd b. Aslam	Amr b. Sa'd al-Jari		
166	Malik						
167	Abu 'Abda	HMYD	Anas				
167	Abu 'Abda	Thabit al-BNANI	Anas				
167	Asad b. Musa	Mahdi b. Maymun	Sa'id al-Jariri	Abu NDRa	Abu Firas		
168	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Nafi' mawla of Ibn 'Umar				
168	Asad b. Musa	Muhammad b. Khazim	al-Hajjaj	Amr b. Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb's father	
169	Asad b. Musa	Muhammad b. Khazim	al-Hajjaj	Amr b. Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb	Shu'ayb's father	
169	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
170	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Abd Allah al-Hadrami	Abu QNAN Ayyun b. Abi al-'Aliya al-Hadrami Abu al-'Aliya al-Hadrami			
170	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Abd Allah al-Hadrami				
170	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
170	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a					
171	Uthman b. Salih						
171	Uthman b. Salih						
171	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
172	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani			
172	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani			
173	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
173	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Mra b. LYSHRH al-Ma'afiri			
173	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. RBAH	Mas'ud b. al-Aswad		
173	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
173	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
173	Uthman b. Salih						
173	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
174	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
174	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
174	al-Layth b. Sa'd						

174	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
174	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
175	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
175	al-Haytham b. Ziyad						
176	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Hasan b. Thawban	Hisham b. Abi Ruqayya				
177	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
177	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama						
177	Abd al-Rahman						
177	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
177	Sa'id b. Sabiq						
177	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
178	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy	Amr b. al-'As		
178	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a					
178	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Harmala b. 'Imran	Tamim b. FR' al-Mahri				
178	Uthman b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
178	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
179	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
179	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah	Muhammad b. Ishaq				
179	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
179	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil				
179	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
179	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
180	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-Mahri			
180	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
180	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
180	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-Mahri			
180	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
180	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
181	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ya'qub b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Abd al-Rahman (Ya'qub's father)				
181	Asad b. Musa	Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad	Muhammad b. Talha	Isma'il			
181	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Qays b. Sumayy		
182	Abd al-Ghaffar b. Da'ud	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Rabi'a b. Laqit				
182	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Rabi'a b. Laqit				
182	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Harmala b. 'Imran	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu FRAS mawla of 'Amr			

182	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
182	Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Yunus b. Yazid	al-Zuhri	Humayd b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
183	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu al-Aswad	Abu Uways	Abu al-Aswad, our mawla			
183	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
183	Uthman b. Salih							
183	Uthman b. Salih							
184	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
184	Uthman b. Salih							
184	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abd al-Rahman b. Abi HLAL	Abu al-Aswad	Abu Uways		
185	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Qays b. Abi Yazid	al-JLAS b. 'Amir	Abd Allah b. Abi Rabi'a		
185	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam							
185	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
185	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
185	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
185	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	al-Mundhir b. 'Abd Allah al-	Hisham b. 'Urwa					
185	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
185	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a						
185	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Azhar b. Yazid al-Ghutayfi				
186	Abd Allah b. Ma'shar al-Ayli							
186	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
186	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib						
187	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama							
187	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
188	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
188	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid						
188	Ibn Lahi'a							
188	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
188	Shaykhs of Egypt							
188	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr							
188	Yazid b. Abi Habib							
189	Shaykhs							
189	Shaykhs							
189	Shaykhs							
189	Shaykhs							

189	Shaykhs							
189	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
190	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
190	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
190	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
191	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
191	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
192	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
192	Ibn Lahi'a							
192	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil					
193	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah	Sulayman b. Yasar				
193	Uthman b. Salih							
193	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Ibn Lahi'a	Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah	Sulayman b. Yasar			
193	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Ibn Lahi'a	Khalid b. Abi 'Imran				
194	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
194	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
196	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
196	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ziyad b. al-'Ajlani						
197	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
197	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib				
197	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
198	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
198	Uthman b. Salih							
198	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
199	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Bahir b. Dhakir al-Ma'afiri					
199	Uthman b. Salih							
199	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
200	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
201	Uthman b. Salih							
201	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
203	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
203	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
203	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
204	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						

204	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
206	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
206	Hisham b. Ishaq						
207	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
208	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Malik b. Anas	Yahya b. Sa'id				
208	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
208	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
208	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
209	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu al-Aswad	Amr b. Aws			
209	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
210	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
211	Uthman b. Salih						
211	Uthman b. Salih						
211	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
213	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
214	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
215	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
216	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
216	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
217	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
217	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
218	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
220	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
221	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
222	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
223	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
223	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
226	Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Abd Allah al-Uwaysi	Abd Allah b. Ja'far al-Zuhri	(Uthman b. Muhammad al-Akhi	Sa'id al-Maqbari	Abu Hurayra		
226	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ziyad b. al-'Ajlan	al-Ghadban b. Yazid al-Bajali			
226	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ziyad b. al-'Ajlan	al-Ghadban b. Yazid al-Bajali			

226	Ya'qub b. Muhammad	Ibrahim b. Sa'd	Abd Allah b. Ja'far	Uthman b. Muhammad	al-A'raj	Abu Hurayra		
227	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ibn ALHAD	Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Ha	Bishr b. Sa'id	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'As		
227	Abd al-Rahman							
227	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jab	Nafi' b. Yazid	Ibn ALHAD	Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Ha	Bishr b. Sa'id	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'As		
227	Asad b. Musa	Shu'ba b. al-Hajjaj	Qatada	Abu al-'Aliya	Ali			
227	Haywa b. Shurayh	Someone	Abd al-Quddus b. Habib	al-Hasan	Umar b. al-Khattab			
227	Haywa b. Shurayh	mawla of Hassan b. al-Nu'm	Yahya b. Abi 'Amr al-Shaybani	Abu Hurayra				
227	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	al-Himmani	Khalaf b. Khalifa	Abu Hashim	Ibn Burayda	Burayda	Messenger	
227	Nu'aym b. Hammad	al-Darawardi	Ibn ALHAD	Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Ha	Bishr b. Sa'id	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'As		
227	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ibn ALHAD	Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Ha	Bishr b. Sa'id	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr b. al-'As		
228	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Malik b. Anas	Yahya b. Sa'id	Sa'id b. Maysara				
228	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jab	Abd al-Rahman b. Zayd b. Aslam						
228	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	Shababa b. Sawwar	al-Faraj b. Fadala	RY'a b. Yazid	Uqba b. 'Amir al-Juhani			
228	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	Muhammad b. Kathir	Isra'il	Abd al-A'la	Bilal b. Abi Musa (actually b.	Anas b. Malik		
229	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam							
229	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
230	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
230	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
230	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Dahhak b. Shurahbil al-Ghafi	Ammar b. Sa'd al-Tujibi				
230	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
230	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
230	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
230	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
231	Abd al-Rahman							
231	Ali b. Ma'bad	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	MKHYS b. Zabban	Judhami	Malik b. 'Atahiya	Messenger
231	Ali b. Ma'bad	Ubayd Allah b. 'Amr al-Jaza	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa a	Uqba b. 'Amir	Messenger	
231	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Hajjaj b. Shadda al-Sana'ani	Abu Salih Sa'id b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Ghifari				
231	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i					
231	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
232	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Ubayd Allah b. Zahr	al-Haytham b. Khalid	Sulaym b. 'Itr			
232	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah					
232	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jab	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah				
232	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
233	Muhammad b. Idris al-Razi							

233	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
234	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil				
235	Abd al-Rahman b. Abi SMH	Abu al-Layth al-A'la b. 'Asim al-Qass					
235	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Ibn Lahi'a	Musa b. Wardan				
235	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira					
235	Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd a	Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Haywa b. Shurayh	Ja'far b. Rabi'a			
236	Sa'id b. 'Isa b. Talid						
236	Shaykhs of Egypt						
237	al-Farazdaq						
237	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd					
238	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
238	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
239	Abd al-Rahman						
239	Shaykhs of Egypt						
239	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
240	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr						
240	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
240	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
241	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak					
242	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
242	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir						
242	Shaykhs of Egypt						
243	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
243	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr						
244	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
244	Hammad b. Miswar Abu Raja'						
244	Shaykhs of Egypt						
245	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam						
247	Ibn Qudayd						
248	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	al-Harith b. Sa'id al-'Utaqi	Abd Allah b. MNYN of Banu 'Ab	Amr b. al-'As		
249	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Imran b. Abi Anas	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Abu Firas Yazid b. Rabah mawla of 'Amr	
249	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Muhammad b. Rashid al-Muradi			
249	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Imran b. Abi Anas	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Amr b. al-'As		
249	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar al-M	Zayd b. al-HBAB	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Imran b. Abi Anas	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Abu Firas Yazid b. Rabah mawla of 'Amr

250	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Amr b. al-'As			
250	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Amr b. al-'As				
250	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah					
250	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Ulayy b. Rabah	Amr b. al-'As			
250	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	mawla of 'Amr	Amr b. al-'As			
250	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Ulayy b. Rabah	Amr b. al-'As			
250	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Abu Qays mawla of 'Amr	Amr b. al-'As				
251	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Amr b. al-'As			
251	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Amr b. al-'As				
251	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Abd Allah b. 'Amr	Amr b. al-'As	
251	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Amr b. al-'As			
252	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rashid, mawla of Habib b. Aw	Habib b. Aws al-	Amr b. al-'As	
252	Asad b. Musa	Yahya b. Abi Za'ida	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rashid, mawla of Habib b. Aw	Habib b. Aws al-	Amr b. al-'As	
252	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Qays b. Sumayy	Amr b. al-'As		
253	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
253	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a						
254	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Amir b. Yahya	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
254	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Raja' b. Abi 'Ata' al-Ma'afiri	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
254	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Raja' b. Abi 'Ata' al-Ma'afiri	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
255	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Amr b. al-Harith	Amir b. Yahya	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubu	Abd Allah b. 'Amr		
255	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadr	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
255	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Hanash b. 'Abd Allah					
255	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Shurahbil b. Yazid					
255	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. A	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
255	Haywa b. Shurayh	Shurahil b. Yazid						
255	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitt	Ayyash	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
255	Mu'adh b. al-Hakam	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. A	Abd al-Rahman b. Rafi' al-Tanu	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
256	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Hasan b. Thawban al-Hawza	Hisham b. Abi Ruqayya	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Abu Sadaqa Muhammad b. 'Abd al-	Nafi' b. Yazid	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				

256	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. A	Abd Allah b. Ya'qub	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
256	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Yahya b. Ayyub	Abu Qabil	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
257	Abd Allah b. Salih	Qibath b. Razin	Ma'afiri	Someone (friend of Ibn 'Amr)	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
257	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Huyay b. 'Abd Allah	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
257	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Umayr b. Malik	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
258	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Huyay b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
258	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
258	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitb	Abd Allah b. 'Iyad	Abu Razin al-Ghafiqi	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
258	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitb	Isa b. Hilal al-Sadafi	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
258	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Hubayra al-Kahlani mawla	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
259	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Akhi Murra al-Z	Kharija b. Hudhafa		
259	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Rabi'a b. Sayf	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
259	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Abi Murra al-Za	Kharija b. Hudhafa		
259	Abd al-Rahman	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Rabi'a b. Sayf	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
259	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	al-Mufaddal b. Fadala	Rabi'a b. Sayf	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
259	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Isa b. Hilal	Abd Allah b. 'Amr	Messenger		
259	Nafi'							
259	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	Rabi'a b. Sayf	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abd Allah b. 'Amr			
259	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. Rashid al-Zawfi	Abd Allah b. Akhi Murra al-Z	Kharija b. Hudhafa		
260	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr				
260	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr				
260	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Khalid b. Yazid	Abd Allah b. Abi Murra Abu al-D	Kharija b. Hudhafa			
260	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr				
260	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Junada b. Abi Umayya	Busr b. Abi Artat		
260	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr				
260	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Junada b. Abi Umayya	Busr b. Abi Artat		
260	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib						
261	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Hudayj b. Abi 'Amr	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
261	Abu al-Aswad Yazid	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			

261	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad				
261	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Hani' b. Mu'awiya al-Sadafi	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad				
261	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	al-Mustawrid b. Shaddad			
262	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Abu Sa'id al-Ghafiqi	Abd Allah b. Abi Sarh			
262	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Dimam b. Isma'il al-Ma'afiri	Ayyash b. 'Abbas					
262	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	al-'Alawi	Abd Allah b. Rabi'a	Abd Allah b. Abi Sarh		
262	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	al-Haytham b. Saff (Shufayy?)	Abd Allah b. Abi Sarh			
263	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Qays b. Abi Yazid	al-Jullas b. 'Amir	Abd Allah b. Rab	Abd Allah b. Abi Sarh	
263	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yahya b. Maymun	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Sufyan b. Wahb			
263	Yusuf b. 'Adi b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Mut	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Someone	Ubayd Allah b. Mughira	Sufyan b. Wahb al-Khawlani		
264	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tu'ma	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
264	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khalid b. Yazid	Thabit b. Yazid al-Khawlani	Ibn 'Abbas			
264	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Khalid b. Yazid	Thabit b. Yazid al-Khawlani	Ibn 'Abbas			
264	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khalid b. Yazid	Thabit b. Yazid al-Khawlani	Ibn 'Abbas			
264	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tu'ma	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
264	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a						
264	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tu'ma	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
264	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Shurahil b. Bakil	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
265	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tu'ma	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
265	Abd al-Rahman							
265	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Tu'ma	Abd Allah b. 'Umar				
265	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Qusayr mawla of Tujib	Abd Allah b. 'Umar			
265	Asad b. Musa							
266	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		
266	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		
266	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani	Abu al-Mu'arik al-Waddani	Ghafiqi			
266	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Azhar b. Yazid al-Ghutayfi					
266	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		
266	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Ka'b b. 'Alqama	Hassan b. Kurayb al-Himyari	Ibn Dhi al-Kala'	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		
267	Abd al-Hamid b. al-Walid Abu Zayd Kabid							
267	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Ja'far b. Rabi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan	
267	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		
267	Abd Allah b. Yusuf	Muhammad b. al-Muhajir	al-'Abbas b. Salim	Mudrik b. 'Abd Allah al-Azdi (poss Abu Mudrik)				
267	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyan		

267	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu 'Ushana al-Mawhibi/al-Ma	Ammar b. Yasir				
267	Amr b. al-Harith	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Thawr	Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Bakr				
267	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Thawr	Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Bakr				
267	Ishaq b. Bakr b. Mudar	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Ja'far b. Rabi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj	Mu'awiya b. Abi
268	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Abu Ayyub al-Ansari			
269	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam				
269	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Abu Ayyub al-Ansari			
269	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran al-Tujibi				
269	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam				
270	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Huyay b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abu Ayyub al-Ansari			
270	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. A	Ziyad b. An'am	Abu Ayyub al-Ansari				
270	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli					
270	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Huyay b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abu Ayyub al-Ansari			
271	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Ubada b. al-Samit			
271	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	al-Sunabihi	Ubada b. al-Samit		
271	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Junada b. Abi Umayya	Ubada b. al-Samit		
271	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Sayyar b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Yazid b. Qawdar	Salama b. Shurayh	Ubada b. al-Samit		
271	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	Sayyar b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Yazid b. Qawdar	Salama b. Shurayh	Ubada b. al-Samit		
271	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Junada b. Abi Umayya	Ubada b. al-Samit		
272	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Uqayl b. Khalid	al-Zuhri	A'idh Allah b. 'Abd Allah Abu	Ubada b. al-Samit		
272	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	al-Zuhri	A'idh Allah b. 'Abd Allah Abu	Ubada b. al-Samit		
272	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham	Ziyad b. 'Abd Allah al-Bakka	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Ab	Abd al-Rahman b. Ubada b. al-Samit		
272	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Someone	Ubada b. al-Samit			
273	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Someone	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Qays b. Sa'd	Messenger	
273	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Amr b. Walid b. 'Abda	Qays b. Sa'd			
273	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abd al-Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik b. f	Qays b. Sa'd				
273	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik b. f	Qays b. Sa'd				
273	Abu Zur'a Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abd al-Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik b. f	Qays b. Sa'd				
273	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ubayd Allah b. Zahr	Bakr b. Sawada	Qays b. Sa'd			
273	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Someone	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Qays b. Sa'd	Messenger	
274	Abd al-Ghaffar b. Da'ud	Bakr b. Mudar	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadr	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah				
274	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadr	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah				
274	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Hamza al-Khawlani	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah			
274	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a						

274	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ja'far b. Rabi'a	Abu Hamza al-Khawlani	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah			
274	Uthman b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadri	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah				
274	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadri	Jabir b. 'Abd Allah				
275	Abd Allah b. Salih	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri				
275	Abd Allah b. Yusuf	Sa'id b. 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Tanukhi						
275	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jabir	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadri	Sahl b. Sa'd al-Sa'idi				
275	Sa'id b. Talid	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Sahl b. Sa'd			
275	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Zur'a 'Amr b. Jabir al-Hadri	Sahl b. Sa'd al-Sa'idi				
275	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Jamil al-Hadhdha'	Sahl b. Sa'd al-Sa'idi				
275	Yahya b. Hassan	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib					
276	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Ayyash b. 'Uqba	Yahya b. Maymun	Sahl b. Sa'd al-Ansari			
276	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Ata' b. Dinar	Abu Yazid al-Khawlani	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
276	Abu Hilal al-Rasibi	Jabala b. 'Atiya	Maslama b. Mukhallad					
276	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Maslama b. Mukhallad					
277	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani (Hani'?)	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
277	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Shuja' Sa'id b. Yazid al-Himn	Khalid b. Abi 'Imran	Hanash al-San'ani	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
277	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abu Hani' Humayd b. Hani'	Ulayy b. Rabah	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
277	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani (Hani'?)	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
277	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Abu Shuja' Sa'id b. Yazid al-Himn	Khalid b. Abi 'Imran	Hanash al-San'ani	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
277	Asad b. Musa	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
278	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Salama b. Uksum	Ibn Hujayra	al-Qasim b. Bara	Abd Allah b. 'Amr	
278	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jabir	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Marzuq al-Tujibi	Hanash b. 'Abd Allah	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
278	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani (Hani'?)	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
278	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Ali al-Hamdani (Thamama	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
278	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Ali al-Hamdani (Thamama	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
278	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani (Hani'?)	Amr b. Malik al-Hubuli (surely s	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
278	Asad b. Musa	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
278	Asad b. Musa	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Haywa b. Shurayh	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
278	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Ali al-Hamdani (Thamama	Fadala b. 'Ubayd			
278	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Marzuq al-Tujibi	Hanash b. 'Abd Allah	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
278	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Marzuq al-Tujibi	Hanash b. 'Abd Allah	Fadala b. 'Ubayd		
279	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Hani' al-Khawlani (Hani'?)	Amr b. Malik Abu 'Ali al-Janbi (	Fadala b. 'Ubayd				
279	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitbi	Ayyash al-Qitbani	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Shayban b. Umayya	Ruwafi' b. Thabit		
279	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	Rabi'a b. Sulaym/Salim mawla	Hanash al-San'ani	Ruwayfi' b. Thabit			

280	Abd al-Rahman							
280	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Thabit b. al-Harith	Abu Hurayra			
280	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Ziyad b. Nu'aym	Wafa' b. Shurayh al-Hadram	Ruwafi' b. Thabit	Messenger	
280	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ayyash b. 'Abbas al-Qitbani	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Shayban b. Umayya al-Qitbani	Ruwayfi' b. Thabit			
280	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Abd al-'Aziz b. Marwan	Abu Hurayra			
280	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Ziyad b. Nu'aym	Wafa' b. Shurayh al-Hadram	Ruwafi' b. Thabit	Messenger	
280	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Shuyaym b. Baytan	Abu Salim al-Jayshani	Abd Allah b. 'Amr				
280	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Ziyad b. Nu'aym	Wafa' b. Shurayh al-Hadram	Ruwafi' b. Thabit	Messenger	
281	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
281	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
281	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
281	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
281	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
281	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Salaman b. 'Amir al-Sha'bani	Abu 'Uthman al-Asbahi	Abu Hurayra			
281	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Lahi'a b. 'Uqba	Abu al-Ward	Abu Hurayra	
281	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Salaman b. 'Amir al-Sha'bani	Abu 'Uthman al-Asbahi	Abu Hurayra			
281	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj Abu al-Samh	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Hurayra			
282	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitbani	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim	Abu Basra		
282	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim	Abu Basra			
282	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khalid b. Yazid	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Abu Basra		
282	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Khayr b. Nu'aym	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim	Abu Basra		
282	Abd al-Rahman							
282	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Suwayd al-Hasib	Abu Hurayra				
282	Ali b. Ma'bad	Ubayd Allah b. 'Amr al-Jaza	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Ab	Abu Basra		
282	Habib b. Marzuq, scribe of Malik	Nephew of al-Zuhri	al-Zuhri	al-Qasim b. Muhammad				
282	Idris b. Yahya al-Khawlani	Abd Allah b. 'Ayyash al-Qitbani	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim	Abu Basra			
283	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Kulayb b. Dhuhl al-Hadrami	Ubayd b. Jabr	Abu Basra		
283	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Kulayb b. Dhuhl al-Hadrami	Ubayd b. Jabr	Abu Basra		
283	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Musa b. Wardan	Abu al-Haytham	Abu Basra			
284	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj	Abu al-Maytha'	Abu Dharr al-Ghifari			
284	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Salim al-Jayshani	Abu Umayya	Abu Dharr		
284	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Yazid b. Nu'aym al-Tujibi	Abu Dharr al-Ghifari			
284	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Amr b. al-'As	Companion	
284	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj	Abu Dharr				

284	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Amr b. al-'As			
284	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj	Abu al-Maytha'	Abu Dharr al-Ghifari			
285	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Abu Dharr al-Ghifari			
285	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Harmala b. 'Imran al-Tujibi	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Abu Dharr		
285	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Ubayd Allah b. Abi Ja'far	Salim b. Abi Salim al-Jayshani	Abu Salim al-Jayshani	Abu Dharr		
285	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Abu Dharr			
285	Sa'id b. 'Isa b. Talid	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Salim al-Jayshani	Abu Dharr		
285	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Abu Dharr			
285	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Abu Dharr			
286	Abd al-Malik b. Hisham							
286	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Hubayb b. Mughfil al-Ghifari			
286	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Malik b. 'Abd Allah al-Baradi	Abu Dharr			
286	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Someone	Abu Dharr		
286	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Bakr b. 'Amr	al-Harith b. Yazid al-Hadrami	Ibn Hujayra (Abd al-Rahman)	Abu Dharr	
287	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
287	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
287	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Qurra b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran	Hubayb b. Mughfil		
287	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Hubayb b. Mughfil al-Ghifari			
287	Abu Zur'a Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Haywa b. Shurayh	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
287	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Abd A	Uqba b. 'Amir			
287	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
287	Ibn Lahi'a	Usama b. Isaf al-Ghifari	Abu Salih Sa'id b. 'Abd al-Rahm	Hubayb b. Mughfil				
287	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Abd al-Ghaffar b. Da'ud al-Harrani	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Ka'b b. 'Alqama	'Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir		
288	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
288	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
288	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
288	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				

288	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
288	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
289	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Abd Allah b. Salih	Harmala b. 'Imran	Abu 'Ushana al-Mawhibi/al-Ma	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Khalid b. 'Ubayd	Mishrah	Uqba b. 'Amir		
289	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Abu Zur'a Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Haywa b. Shurayh	Khalid b. 'Ubayd	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
289	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Harmala b. 'Imran	Abu 'Ushana al-Mawhibi/al-Ma	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Khalid b. 'Ubayd	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir			
289	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
289	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Yahya b. Ayyub	Amr b. al-Harith	Abu 'Ushana	Uqba b. 'Amir			
290	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir				
290	Abd Allah b. Salih	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir				
290	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu 'Ushana al-Mawhibi/al-Ma	Uqba b. 'Amir				
290	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Wahb	Ma'ruf b. Suwayd al-Judhami	Abu 'Ushana	Uqba b. 'Amir			
290	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Abu Marhum 'Abd al-Rahim b.	Yazid b. Muhammad al-Qurashi	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir		
290	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Musa b. 'Ulayy	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir				
290	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Yazid b 'Abd al-'Aziz	Yazid b. Muhammad al-Qurashi	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir		
290	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu 'Ushana	Uqba b. 'Amir					
290	Sa'id b. 'Isa b. Talid	Ibn Wahb	Ma'ruf b. Suwayd al-Judhami	Abu 'Ushana	Uqba b. 'Amir			
290	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Mishrah b. 'Ahan	Uqba b. 'Amir				
291	Abd al-Rahman							
291	Abd al-Rahman							
291	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
291	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Qubath b. Razin	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir				
291	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Uqba b. 'Amir			
291	Someone	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Rabi'a b. Qays al-Janbi	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Ya'qub	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Ya'qub	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			

292	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Ya'qub	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Wahib b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Shu'ayb b. Zur'a	Uqba b. 'Amir			
292	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Shu'ayb b. Zur'a	Uqba b. 'Amir			
293	Abd Allah b. 'Abbad al-'Abdi	Ibn Lahi'a	Uqba b. Muslim	Uqba b. 'Amir				
293	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Hisham b. Abi Ruqayya	Uqba b. 'Amir			
293	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Uqba b. 'Amir				
293	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
293	Ali b. Ma'bad	Ubayd Allah b. 'Amr al-Jaza	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa a	Uqba b. 'Amir		
293	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu Qabil	Uqba b. 'Amir				
293	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
293	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Bakr b. Mudar	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Sa'id al-Qitbani	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Uqba b. 'Amir		
294	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Someone	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Ibn Lahi'a	Abu al-Khayr	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Juhani					
294	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Sa'id al-Qitbani	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Uqba b. 'Amir		
294	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Uqba b. 'Amir			
294	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu 'Imran Aslam	Uqba b. 'Amir			
295	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
295	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
295	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Qayni				
295	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Juhani				
295	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Nafi' b. Yazid	Abu Marhum 'Abd al-Rahim b.	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Wahb	Yahya b. Ayyub	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Ju	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani		
296	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Muhammad b. al-Mutawakkil	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhar	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			

296	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Yahya b. Ayyub	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
296	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
297	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
297	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
297	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
297	Hajjaj b. Rishdin	Rishdin b. Sa'd	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
297	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Sadafi	al-Muqri'	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Abu Marhum 'Abd al-Rahim b. I	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani		
297	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Sadafi	al-Muqri'	Sa'id b. Abi Ayyub	Abu Marhum 'Abd al-Rahim b. I	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani		
298	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
298	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
298	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
298	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
298	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani			
298	Ibn Lahi'a	Zabban b. Fa'id al-Hamrawi	Sahl b. Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani	Mu'adh b. Anas al-Juhani				
298	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
298	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Sahl b. Tha'alaba	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
299	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
299	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Jabala b. Nafi'	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Ibn Wahb	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Nafi' b. Yazid	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
299	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
299	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
299	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
299	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	RABY b. Mu'awiya	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				
300	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jalil	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi				

300	Abu Zur'a Wahb Allah b. Rashid	Haywa b. Shurayh					
300	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. Sarh Abu al-Tahir	Abd al-Malik b. Abi Karima	Ubayd b. Thumama al-Muradi				
300	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik	Abd al-Malik b. Mulayl	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
300	Ibn Qudayd	Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Sarh Al	Abd al-Malik b. Abi Karima al-M	Ubayd b. Thumama al-Muradi			
300	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Nafi' b. Yazid	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
301	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
301	Abd al-Rahman						
301	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Darraj b. al-Samh	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
301	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
301	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Sulayman b. Ziyad	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi			
301	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Abu Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahman	Abd Allah b. al-Harith b. Jaz' al-Zubaydi		
301	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	al-Saffah, brother of al-Zubaydi	Abu Hurayra		
302	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Alqama b. Rithma al-Balawi	Amr b. al-'As	
302	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Abd A	Ibn Sandar		
302	Asad b. Musa	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Alqama b. Rithma al-Balawi	Amr b. al-'As	
302	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Sadafi	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Abu Sulayman, mawla of Um	Abu Ramda'	
302	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Alqama b. Rithma al-Balawi	Amr b. al-'As	
302	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Abd A	Ibn Sandar		
303	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Daylam al-Jayshani		
303	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Daylam al-Jayshani		
303	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu Thawr al-Fahmi			
303	Hani' b. al-Mutawakkil	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Daylam al-Jayshani		
303	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Abd Allah b. Sandar	Sandar	
303	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu Thawr al-Fahmi			
304	Abd Allah b. Salih	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu Thawr al-Fahmi			
304	Abd al-Malik b. Nusayr	Imran b. 'Atiya	Abu Shurayh	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu Thawr al-Fahmi		
304	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Utba b. al-Nadr		
304	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abd al-Rahman b. Shimasa al-M	Someone	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Udays	
304	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Ayyash b. 'Abbas	Abu Husayn al-Hajari	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Udays		
304	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Utba b. al-Nadr		
305	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Tha'alaba Abu al-Kanud	Malik b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri		
305	Ibn Lahi'a	Ubayd Allah b. al-Mughira	Abu Firas	Abu Zam'a	Messenger		
305	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd al-'Aziz b. 'Abd al-Malik	Abu Zam'a al-Balawi				
305	Muhammad b. Yahya al-Sadafi	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yahya b. Maymun al-Hadrami	Wada'a al-Hamdi	Abu Musa al-Ghafiqi Malik b. 'Ubada	

305	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Tha'alaba Abu al-Kanud	Malik b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri		
305	Uthman b. Salih	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Sulayman	Tha'alaba Abu al-Kanud	Malik b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri		
306	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Khunays b. 'Amir al-Ma'afiri	Abu Qabil	Junada b. Abi Umayya			
306	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Junada b. Abi Umayya		
306	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Hudhayfa al-Bariqi	Junada b. Abi Umayya	
306	Ibn Wahb	Amr b. al-Harith	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Junada b. Abi Umayya		
306	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr	Junada b. Abi Umayya		
307	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
307	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
307	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Sa'id b. Abi Shamir al-Saba'i	Sufyan b. Wahb al-Khawlani		
307	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
308	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Muhammad b. Yazid al-Mazini	Abd Allah b. 'Awf	Abu Jumu'a Habib b. Siba'	
308	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Kathir b. al-A'raj al-Sadafi	Abu Fatima al-Azdi		
308	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Urfuta b. 'Amr al-Hadrami	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
308	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Muhammad b. Yazid al-Mazini	Abd Allah b. 'Awf	Abu Jumu'a Habib b. Siba'	
308	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Shu'ayb b. Abi Ayyub	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Suwayd b. Qays al-Balawi	Mu'awiya b. Hudayj		
308	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Kathir b. al-A'raj al-Sadafi	Abu Fatima al-Azdi		
308	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hubuli	Abu Fatima al-Azdi		
309	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Amr al-Bakka'i	Ibn A'war		
309	Abd Allah b. Salih	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh	Amira b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Ibn Hamiq		
309	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Mukhayyis b. Zibyan	Abd al-Rahman b. Hassan	Judhami	Malik b. 'Atahiya
309	Abd al-Malik b. Nusayr	Imran b. 'Atiya al-Judhami	Abd al-Rahman b. Shurayh (Ab	Amira b. 'Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Abd Allah al-Ma'afiri	Ibn Hamiq	
309	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	Bakr b. 'Amr al-Ma'afiri	al-Harith b. Yazid al-Hadrami	Rabi'a al-Jurashi	Abu Fatima al-Azdi	
309	Talq b. al-Samh al-Lakhmi	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Saba'i	Amr al-Bakka'i	Ibn A'war ('Amr b. Sufyan)		
310	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Yahya b. Ayyub	Abd al-Rahman b. Razin	Muhammad b. Yazid b. Abi Z	Ayyub b. QTN	Ubada b. Nusayy
310	Ibn Wahb	Haywa b. Shurayh	Uqba b. Muslim	Kathir			Ubayy b. 'Imara
310	Mahdi b. Ja'far	Abd Allah b. Mubarak	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu Khayr Marthad b. 'Abd	Malik b. Hubayra	
310	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	Muhammad b. 'Isa	Hammad b. Zayd	Muhammad b. Ishaq	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Ma	Malik b. Hubayra
310	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Yahya b. Ayyub	Abd al-Rahman b. Razin	Muhammad b. Yazid b. Abi Ziya	Ayyub b. QTN	Ubayy b. 'Imara	
310	Uqba b. Muslim	Abd Allah b. al-Harith	Kathir				
311	Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Ibn Hawala al-Azdi		
311	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Ibn Hawala al-Azdi		
311	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Jal	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Ibn Hawala al-Azdi		
311	Sa'id b. Abi Maryam	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Ziyad b. Nu'aym al-Hadrami	Hibban b. Buhh al-Suda'i		

311	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Rabi'a b. Laqit al-Tujibi	Ibn Hawala al-Azdi			
311	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	Abu Ishaq al-Khaffaf	Imran b. 'Abd Allah	Bukayr mawla of 'Mra	Muhajir mawla of Umm Salama			
312	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad b. A	Ziyad b. Nu'aym	Ziyad b. al-Harith al-Suda'i				
313	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu 'Amira of Muzayna				
314	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Abu al-Khayr Marthad b. 'Abd A	Abu Muslim			
314	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Ya'qub	Abu Shu'ayb mawla of Abu Wa	Abu Wahwah			
314	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Ya'qub	Abu Shu'ayb mawla of Abu V	Abu Wahwah		
314	Amr b. Sawad	Ibn Wahb	Yahya b. Ayyub	Ja'far b. Rabi'a	Ulayy b. Rabah	Shurahbil b. Hasana		
314	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Hajjaj b. Shaddad al-San'	Abu Salih Sa'id b. 'Abd al-Rahm	Sila b. al-Harith al-Ghifari				
315	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Ibn Ruwayfi'	Abu Mulayka al-Balawi			
315	Abu al-Aswad al-Nadr b. 'Abd al-Ja	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Abu Mulayka al-Balawi			
315	al-Muqri' ('Abd Allah b. Yazid)	Haywa b. Shurayh	al-Dahhak b. Shurahbil al-Ghafi	Ammar b. Sa'd al-Tujibi				
315	Asad b. Musa	Ibn Lahi'a	al-Harith b. Yazid	Ulayy b. Rabah	Mas'ud b. al-Aswad			
315	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
315	Shu'ayb b. al-Layth	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Ibn Ruwayfi'	Abu Mulayka al-Balawi			
316	Abd al-Rahman							
316	Ibn Lahi'a	Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Sa	Abu Tamim al-Jayshani	Huyayy				
316	Ibn Lahi'a	Yazid b. Abi Habib	Kharasha b. al-Harith					
316	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr	Ibn Lahi'a						
316	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
316	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
317	Abd Allah b. Salih	al-Layth b. Sa'd	Isma'il b. Umayya	Amr b. Sa'id	Mu'adh b. Abd Allah b. Habib	Abu Su'ad		
317	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	Ibn Lahi'a	Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Ashaj	Sulayman b. Yasar				
317	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Abu Ghutayf	Hatib b. Abi Balta'a				
317	Ibn Lahi'a	Bakr b. Sawada	Sa'id b. Abi Shamr al-Saba'i	Malik b. Zahir				
317	Ibn Wahb	Yazid b. Qawdar						
317	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Ibn Lahi'a	Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Ashaj	Sulayman b. Yasar			
318	Abd al-Malik b. Maslama	al-Layth b. Sa'd						
318	Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbar	Abd al-Samad b. 'Abd al-Wa	Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd Allah b.	Zayd b. Aslam				
318	Yusuf b. 'Adi	Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak	Ibn Lahi'a	Khalid b. Abi 'Imran	Sulayman b. Yasar			
319	al-Waqidi							
319	Sa'id b. Talid	Ibn Wahb	Ibrahim b. Nashit	Ibn Abi Husayn	Shahr b. Hawshab	Abd al-Rahman b. Ghanam/Abu Malik/Abu 'Amir		
319	Sa'id b. 'Ufayr							
319	Yahya b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr	al-Layth b. Sa'd						

[illegible]

[illegible]

s'ud

Sufyan