

Muḥammad's Deputies in Medina

MICHAEL COOK
Princeton University

(mcook@princeton.edu)

Abstract

It would be a reasonable inference from our sources that each time Muḥammad was away from Medina he left behind a deputy. The object of this paper is to collect and interpret the information our sources provide about these deputies. After a brief introduction, the second and third sections assemble and contextualize the data. The fourth section then discusses questions of interpretation: how far we can rely on the information in our sources, what this information can tell us about the kind of people Muḥammad would appoint as deputies, and how the emerging pattern might be explained historically. The main finding is that the data, if at all reliable, indicate that deputies were frequently people with little ability to cope with emergencies, and that Muḥammad must have been giving priority to political considerations in choosing them. Readers interested only in the interpretative questions could skip the second and third sections.

1. Introduction

One respect in which leaders vary enormously is their readiness to delegate authority.¹ But no leader can avoid such delegation altogether, if only because humans lack the ability to be in two places at once; and how a leader reacts to this constraint can tell us much about the character of his leadership. Admittedly in the case of Muḥammad we have the word of ʿĀ'isha that when he was taken on his night journey, it was his spirit (*rūḥ*) that traveled while his body remained behind;² but this was a unique event in his life, and in

1. I have spoken about the material discussed in this paper in several settings—at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (for the Research Group on Ancient Arabia at the Institute for Advanced Studies, 2010), at the University of Wisconsin (as part of the Merle Curti Lectures, 2014), at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (at a colloquium in honor of Patricia Crone, 2015), at the University of Pennsylvania Middle East Center (2015), at the University of Maryland (for the First Millennium Seminar, 2015), and at the University of Chicago (for the Middle East History and Theory Conference, 2015). In each case I profited from the comments and questions of my audiences. I also received numerous useful remarks on an early written draft from three students in my graduate seminar in the spring of 2015: Usaama al-Azami, Michael Dann, and Jelena Radovanović. A subsequent draft was read by Ella Landau-Tasserion and Michael Lecker; they generously provided me with extensive comments, references, and corrections. Finally, I have benefited from the remarks of three anonymous reviewers.

2. SS 1-2:399.20 = SG 183. I use abbreviations for the sources I cite most often: SS is the *Sīra* of Ibn Hishām in the edition of Saqqā and others, SG is the same work in the translation of Guillaume, and W is Wāqidi's *Maghāzī* in the edition of Jones (I do not provide page references to the translation of Faizer and others, since

any case such a separation would not have solved the delegation problem. One context in which Muḥammad was accordingly unable to avoid delegation was when he decided to mount an expedition—usually but not always for military purposes—outside his home base in Medina. On each such occasion he faced a stark choice. If he chose to stay at home he needed to appoint a commander to lead the expedition.³ Alternatively, if he chose to lead the expedition himself, he had to appoint a deputy to take his place at home.⁴ This was a choice that he faced on average around seven times a year during his decade in Medina, so that it was by no means a trivial aspect of his governance.⁵

It is the occasions on which Muḥammad chose to lead the expedition himself and appoint a deputy over Medina that are our primary concern in this article. It has two objectives. One is simply to bring together the relevant data from the sources, and the other is to ask what this information, if reliable, can tell us about Muḥammad's style of leadership. As to the question whether the information is in fact reliable, I will offer some comments but no definitive answer.

Before we go to the sources, it is worth asking what we might expect to find in them. If for a moment we put ourselves in Muḥammad's sandals, what would we be looking for in a deputy? One obvious qualification for the job would be trustworthiness: to hand over one's base to someone one cannot trust does not seem like a good idea. The other obvious qualification would be competence—in particular the ability to handle political and military trouble should it arise in Muḥammad's absence. During much of his time in Medina, he confronted enmity and opposition among various groups, be they pagans, Jews, or Hypocrites (*munāfiqūn*). And even when he had overcome his enemies, he was still at the head of a fractious coalition. The tension between his Meccan and Medinese supporters—the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār—threatened discord on more than one occasion: it nearly exploded at Muraysī^c during the raid on the Banū 'l-Muṣṭaliq thanks to a minor incident at a watering hole, it reappeared in the aftermath of the Battle of Ḥunayn, and it threatened to disrupt the community on Muḥammad's death. So it stands to reason that Muḥammad would set considerable store by appointing deputies with the competence to nip trouble in the bud. Two things would tend to correlate with such competence. One would be experience: a rookie deputy would be more likely to make a mess of things than one who had held the post before. The other would be social and political clout: a deputy who could mobilize men and resources in an emergency would do a better job than one who could not. So in effect we have three criteria: trustworthiness, experience, and clout. We might therefore expect that having identified a limited number of men who met these requirements, Muḥammad would have made it his practice to appoint them again and

it gives the pagination of Jones's edition).

3. There were thirty-seven such expeditions if we go by Ibn Hishām, fifty-two if we go by Wāqidī. There are accounts suggesting that initially Muḥammad did not appoint commanders, with unfortunate results (Landau-Tasseron, "Features of the pre-conquest Muslim army", 320).

4. Ibn Hishām and Wāqidī are in agreement on the twenty-seven such expeditions. These are very clearly expeditions mounted on specific occasions with specific objectives; they are not part of a pattern of itinerant rulership.

5. He faced it sixty-four times in all if we go by Ibn Hishām, seventy-nine if we go by Wāqidī.

again.

With these a priori expectations in mind, let us now proceed to the data. Readers interested only in the upshot of this study may, however, prefer to skip the following two sections and go directly to the discussion.

2. The data

2.1 Terminology

The language in which the sources inform us of Muḥammad's appointments of deputies is not uniform, and we have always to reckon with the possibility that the usage of our sources may be anachronistic. But the pattern is fairly consistent, with the terms employed consisting overwhelmingly of variations on two roots: *kh-l-f* and *ʿ-m-l*.

Let us begin with the root *kh-l-f*.⁶ As will be seen, one of our two major sources for Muḥammad's deputies is Wāqidi (d. 207/823), who regularly uses the verb *istakhlafa* ("he appointed as deputy"), as for example when he tells us that at the time of a certain expedition Muḥammad "appointed 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān as deputy over Medina" (*istakhlafa al-nabī (ṣ) 'alā 'l-Madīna 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān*).⁷ On three occasions he uses another form of the root, the verb *khallafa* (literally "he left behind", but also "he appointed as his *khalīfa*"),⁸ as when he says of Abū Lubāba ibn 'Abd al-Mundhir that Muḥammad "appointed him deputy over Medina" (*khallafahu 'alā 'l-Madīna*).⁹ He never uses the noun *khalīfa* in the sense of "deputy", but a somewhat later author, Balādhurī (d. 279/892f), frequently does so. He tells us, for example, that at the time of the expedition to Ḥudaybiya, "his deputy in Medina was Ibn Umm Maktūm" (*kāna khalīfatuhu bi'l-Madīna Ibn Umm Maktūm*).¹⁰ Often he refers to the deputy as "the deputy of the Messenger of God" (*khalīfat Rasūl Allāh*),¹¹ and he occasionally employs the abstract noun *khilāfa*, "deputyship".¹² But he too uses the verb *istakhlafa*.¹³ The use of the root in the context of delegation is Koranic:

6. I owe to David Graf the information that the noun ḤLF occurs in an as yet unpublished Thamūdic inscription from Ḥumayma.

7. W 196.4. In addition Wāqidi or his sources use the term in the following passages: W 7.20, 7.21, 180.16, 182.6, 183.18, 197.3, 199.3, 371.8, 384.4, 402.11, 496.17, 537.13, 537.20, 546.20, 573.8, 636.11, 995.14.

8. See Lane, *Lexicon*, 793c.

9. W 101.9. The sense here cannot be "he left him behind" since Abū Lubāba initially accompanied Muḥammad on the way to Badr; Muḥammad then had second thoughts and sent him back (see W 159.11). For the other passages in which Wāqidi uses *khallafa* see W 277.13 (*khallafahu bi'l-Madīna yuṣallī bi'l-nās*) and 684.4 (*khallafahu 'alā 'l-Madīna*). In the last case Wāqidi has already used the verb *istakhlafa* of the same person regarding the same expedition (W 636.11).

10. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 350.21; similarly 287.5, 287.11, 287.17, 287.22, 339.4, 340.17, 341.13, 349.3, 352.22, 368.18, 368.24. Typically the preposition is "over" rather than "in".

11. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 294.2, 309.23, 310.18, 310.24, 338.15, 340.7, 342.15, 345.18, 347.19, 352.11, 353.11, 364.13, 368.17. This, of course, is a standard title of the Caliphs; *khalīfa* means both "deputy" and "successor".

12. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 339.21 (where Ibn Umm Maktūm is described as *muqīm^{an} 'alā khilāfat Rasūl Allāh*), 352.22.

13. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 289.7, 311.19, 311.24, 348.13, 350.22.

in Q7:142 Moses, before going to speak with God, tells Aaron: “Be my deputy among my people (*ukhlufnī fī qawmī*).” Yet the first form of the verb is rarely used in our sources with regard of Muḥammad’s deputies.¹⁴

Turning to the root *ʿm-l*, we find that one of our other major sources for the deputies, Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833), always uses the verb *istaʿmala* (“he appointed as his agent”) when speaking of the appointment of a deputy. Thus he tells us that at the time of his first expedition Muḥammad “appointed Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda as his agent over Medina” (*istaʿmala ʿalā ʿl-Madīna Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda*).¹⁵ But Wāqidī too occasionally employs this verb.¹⁶ Neither of them uses the noun *ʿamil* (“agent”), though Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 240/854f) in his account of Muḥammad’s deputies does so once in a slightly ambiguous context.¹⁷

There is perhaps some reason to think that the use of the root *kh-l-f* in the context of Muḥammad’s deputies is older than the use of *ʿm-l*. Whenever Wāqidī is unambiguously quoting earlier sources, the verb used is *istakhlafa* rather than *istaʿmala*—though this may not mean very much since *istakhlafa* is his own preferred usage, and he could simply be assimilating earlier sources to his own practice.¹⁸ The same could be true of Ibn Hishām when he quotes the father of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Muḥammad al-Darāwardī (the latter being a well-known Medinese traditionist who died in 187/802f) as using the verb *istaʿmala* in reference to the appointment of a deputy at the time of the expedition to Tabūk.¹⁹ But in one place Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767f), who does not usually give us information about the appointment of deputies, quotes a tradition going back to ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/687f) about the appointment of a deputy at the time of the Faṭḥ (the conquest of Mecca); here the verb used—contrary to Ibn Hishām’s normal usage—is *istakhlafa*.²⁰ My impression is

14. I have noted a couple of exceptions. Maqrīzī in his account of the expedition against the Banū Liḥyān says of Muḥammad: *wa-kāna yakhlufuhu ʿalā ʿl-Madīna Ibn Umm Maktūm (Imtāʿ al-asmāʿ, 1:258.15)*. Ibn Ishāq, in describing how Muḥammad appointed ʿAlī to take care of his family during the Tabūk expedition, has Muḥammad say *fa-ʾkhlufnī fī ahli wa-ahlīka* (SS 3-4:520.2 = SG 604), but this incident is implicitly linked to the Koranic verse.

15. SS 1-2:591.1 = SG 737 no. 337. For other examples see SS 1-2:598.10 = SG 738 no. 345, SS 1-2:601.6 = SG 738 no. 348. Ibn Hishām’s usage is so consistent that there is little point in giving exhaustive references for it; in all he uses the verb regarding the appointment of deputies twenty-eight times.

16. W 159.11, 404.4, 441.1. In none of these cases is it likely that in deviating from his usual practice Wāqidī is respecting the exact wording of a source.

17. Following his account of the death of Muḥammad in 11/632, Khalīfa gives an account of those who held office under him (Khalīfa, *Taʾrīkh*, 61–4). Here the first section has the heading *tasmīyat ʿummālihi (š)*, which we would normally render something like “naming of his governors” (61.8); the list begins with Muḥammad’s deputies, then goes on to his governors. In his account of the appointment of the deputies (including one that Muḥammad appointed in Mecca when he left it after the Conquest) he uses only the verb *istakhlafa* (five times in eleven lines), whereas for the governors he uses *istaʿmala* (62.3) and *wallā* (62.6, 62.12). Without any ambiguity Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī (d. 430/1038) describes Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa as *ʿamil al-Nabī (š) ʿalā ʿl-Madīna ʿam Ḥunayn (Maʿrifat al-Šahāba, 1451.12)*.

18. For cases in which Wāqidī is unambiguously citing information about the appointment of deputies from a specific source, see W 180.16, 183.18, 197.3, 402.11.

19. SS 3-4:519.10 = SG 783 no. 860. For ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Muḥammad al-Darāwardī see Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 18:187–95.

20. SS 3-4:399.19 = SG 545; the same verb appears in a parallel passage from the Rāzī recension of Ibn

that other sources that are plausibly old likewise use the verb *istakhlafa*.²¹

The only other roots I have noted in this context are ²-*m-r*, *w-l-y*, and *n-w-b*. Ibn Ishāq employs the verb *ammara*, “to appoint as *amīr*”, in relation to the arrangements made by Muḥammad while he was on the way to Badr,²² and Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/860) likewise uses the term *amīr* when referring to the appointment of deputies.²³ Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) in an entry on Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa says that the Prophet put him in charge of—*wallāhu*—Medina when he went out to Khaybar.²⁴ Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) uses the term *nuwwāb*, which does indeed mean “deputies”; but I have not seen it used elsewhere in the context of the deputies appointed by Muḥammad.²⁵

The fact that different roots are used to refer to deputies raises the question whether there might be a distinction between more than one kind of deputy. As we will see, there is a small amount of evidence that would support such a distinction, but it is not linked to the use of the two main roots.

2.2 Three early sources for Muḥammad's deputies

Three early sources provide us with either a list of deputies or the information that enables us to generate one.

Wāqidī provides such a list in the introductory section of his *Maghāzī*.²⁶ He has just informed us that the number of expeditions in which Muḥammad himself participated was twenty-seven (as opposed to the fifty-two which he sent out but did not accompany).²⁷ He then tells us whom Muḥammad appointed as deputy (*istakhlafa*) on each occasion, naming the expedition and the deputy; in reproducing the information below, I number

Ishāq's work quoted in Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 1/1627.16 = *History*, 8:168. It should be understood that Ibn Ishāq's account of the life of Muḥammad was current in numerous transmissions that differed from one another to a greater or lesser extent; the only transmission that survives in a form approaching completeness is that embedded in the *Sīra* of Ibn Hishām.

21. Thus Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845) in his entry on Ibn Umm Maktūm uses the verb in his own voice (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:150.26), after which it appears ten times in the traditions he quotes (151.3 and the four traditions immediately following, 153.15 and the two traditions immediately following). These traditions go back to traditionists of the generation of the Successors.

22. SS 1-2:688.17 = SG 331 (*ammara Abā Lubāba ʿalā ʿl-Madīna*). This departure from normal usage might be significant, see below, text to note 334.

23. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 125.16, 127.2, 127.3. His usage could be affected by the fact that he includes these deputies in a wider category of appointees whom he terms *umarāʾ Rasūl Allāh* (125.15).

24. Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, 3:181.8. See also below, note 334 and text to note 342.

25. Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn ibn ʿArabī, *Muḥāḍarat al-abrār*, 1:75.3, and cf. 77.18.

26. W 7.20. The *isnād* is *qālū*, “they said”, referring back to the massive composite *isnād* with which the work opens.

27. The number twenty-seven is Wāqidī's (W 7.14). Fifty-two is my count based on his list (W 2-7) with a minor adjustment to eliminate a doublet: the expedition of ʿAbdallāh ibn Unays against Sufyān ibn Khālīd al-Hudhālī makes two appearances in the list (W 3.9, 4.12), but only the second is matched by an account in the body of the text (W 531-3).

the expeditions and add the date of each as given by Wāqidī.²⁸ The text of the list as we have it omits one expedition, no. 6; this is doubtless a scribal error, and I supply the missing information from the body of Wāqidī's work.²⁹ The column on the far right gives a reference to the account of the expedition in the body of the work. Where this account provides information about the deputy, the reference takes the form of a page and line number; but where such information is not given, I give the page number or numbers for the entire account. As can be seen, Wāqidī omits to give the relevant information in a third of the cases.

1. Şafar 2	Waddān ³⁰	Sa'd ibn 'Ubāda	W 11–12
2. Rabī' I 2	Buwāṭ	Sa'd ibn Mu'adh	W 12
3. Rabī' I 2	Kurz ibn Jābir ³¹	Zayd ibn Ḥāritha	W 12
4. Jumādā II 2	Dhū 'l-'Ushayra	Abū Salama ibn 'Abd al-Asad	W 12f
5. Ramaḍān 2	Badr al-qitāl	Abū Lubāba ibn 'Abd al-Mundhir ³²	W 101.8 ³³
6. Shawwāl 2	Qaynuqā'	Abū Lubāba ibn 'Abd al-Mundhir	W 180.16
7. Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 2	Sawīq	Abū Lubāba ibn 'Abd al-Mundhir	W 182.6
8. Muḥarram 3	Kudr ³⁴	Ibn Umm Maktūm al-Ma'īṣī	W 183.18
9. Rabī' I 3	Dhū Amarr ³⁵	'Uthmān ibn 'Affān	W 196.4
10. Jumādā I 3	Buḥrān ³⁶	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 197.3
11. Shawwāl 3	Uḥud	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 199.3 ³⁷
12. Shawwāl 3	Ḥamrā' al-Asad	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 334–40
13. Rabī' I 4	Banū 'l-Naḍīr	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 371.8
14. Dhū 'l-Qa'da 4	Badr al-Maw'id	'Abdallāh ibn Rawāḥa	W 384.4
15. Muḥarram 5	Dhāt al-Riqā'	'Uthmān ibn 'Affān	W 402.11
16. Rabī' I 5	Dūmat al-Jandal	Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa	W 404.4
17. Sha'bān 5	Muraysī'	Zayd ibn Ḥāritha	W 404–26
18. Dhū 'l-Qa'da 5	Khandaq	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 441.1

28. I take the dates from Wāqidī's chronological summary (W 2–7), where necessary converting them to the form "month year". Like Jones, I base my tables on Wāqidī's dating "only because his chronological system is more complete" (Jones, "Chronology of the *maghāzī*", 245, and cf. 272, 276).

29. W 180.16. The omission is at W 8.1.

30. So in the list of deputies (W 7.20), but in the body of the work this expedition is referred to as Ghazwat al-Abwā' (W 11.17, and cf. 2.12).

31. In the body of the work this expedition is referred to as Ghazwat Badr al-Ūlā (W 12.9).

32. For the view that he was in fact present at the battle, see Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, 1:192.3. I will not be concerned with the deputy Muḥammad appointed over "Qubā" and the people of the 'Āliya" at this time (W 101.9).

33. Also W 159.11, 180.16.

34. In the body of the work this expedition is referred to as Ghazwat Qarārat al-Kudr (W 182.10).

35. In the body of the work this expedition is referred to as Ghazwat Ghaṭafān bi-Dhī Amarr (W 193.13).

36. In the body of the work this expedition is referred to as Ghazwat Banī Sulaym bi-Buḥrān bi-nāḥiyat al-Fur' (W 196.6, so vocalized).

37. Also W 277.13.

19. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 5	Banū Qurayza	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 496.17
20. Rabīʿ I 6	Banū Liḥyān	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 537.13
21. Rabīʿ II 6	Ghāba	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 537.20 ³⁸
22. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 6	Ḥudaybiya	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 573.8
23. Jumādā I 7	Khaybar	Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī (Abū Dharr) ³⁹	W 636.11
24. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 7	ʿUmrat al-qaḍiyya ⁴⁰	Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī ⁴¹	W 731–41
25. Ramaḍān 8	Fatḥ, etc. ⁴²	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 780–960
26. Rajab 9	Tabūk	Ibn Umm Maktūm Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa (Muḥammad ibn Maslama) ⁴³	W 995.14
27. Dhū ʿl-Ḥijja 10	Ḥajjat Rasūl Allāh ⁴⁴	Ibn Umm Maktūm	W 1088–1115

Ibn Hishām does not provide a list of deputies, but the information he gives enables us to construct one. In the list that follows I take Wāqidi’s listing of the expeditions and their dates as a template and substitute the names of the deputies as given by Ibn Hishām, together with references to the Arabic text of his *Sīra*. Because Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām do not always agree on the chronology of the expeditions, my listing entails some changes to the order in which Ibn Hishām—and presumably Ibn Ishāq before him—present the expeditions, as can be seen from the page numbers. But there is no disagreement between

38. Also W 546.20.

39. For Sibāʿ as deputy see also W 684.4. At 637.1 he adds that “it is said” that the deputy was Abū Dharr, *sc.* al-Ghifārī, but prefers the view that it was Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa. I indicate non-preferred alternatives in parentheses.

40. Usually known as the ʿUmrat al-qaḍāʾ (see W 6 n. 1 and 731 n. 1); I use this latter form when speaking in my own voice.

41. Note however that Ibn Saʿd quotes from Wāqidi a report that implies that Abū Ruhm was with the expedition (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:180.2).

42. The Fatḥ is the Conquest of Mecca, which led on to the Battle of Ḥunayn and an attack on Ṭāʿif. I will not be concerned with the deputy Muḥammad appointed over Mecca at this time (W 889.12, 959.13).

43. In his list, Wāqidi gives the deputy as Ibn Umm Maktūm, adding “and it is said Muḥammad ibn Maslama al-Ashhālī” (W 8.11). In his account of the expedition in the body of the work, however, Wāqidi identifies the deputy as Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī, again adding that “it is said” that it was Muḥammad ibn Maslama, this being the only expedition (*sc.* led by the Prophet) in which he did not participate (W 995.14). But in a quotation from Wāqidi found in Ibn ʿAsākir’s history of Damascus we read that the deputy was Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa, or it is said Muḥammad ibn Maslama, or it is said Ibn Umm Maktūm, with Muḥammad ibn Maslama preferred (*athbatuhum ʿindanā, Taʿrīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Shīrī, 2:35.18); according to the *isnād*, Ibn ʿAsākir received his text of Wāqidi by much the same line of transmission as we do (compare 33.12 and W 1.2), so the discrepancy is unexpected. Altogether, the unusual proliferation of candidates for the position of deputy for this particular expedition may be related to the problem of absenteeism associated with it in the sources; for anyone who was not there, to have been appointed deputy in Medina could justify an absence that was otherwise potentially problematic.

44. So Wāqidi’s list (W 8.12), but in the body of the work he refers to it as the Ḥajjat al-wadāʿ (W 1088.5). Note that I use the conventional vocalization *ḥijja* in the month-name “Dhū ʿl-Ḥijja”, but defer to the vocalization marked in the text of Wāqidi in writing “Ḥajjat Rasūl Allāh” and “Ḥajjat al-wadāʿ”. For the two vocalizations see Lane, *Lexicon*, 514b.

Wāqidī and Ibn Ishāq—and hence Ibn Hishām—as to either the number or the identity of the expeditions led by Muḥammad.⁴⁵

1. Şafar 2	Waddān	Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda	SS 1-2:591.1
2. Rabīʿ I 2	Buwāṭ	Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Maṣʿūd	SS 1-2:598.10
3. Rabīʿ I 2	Kurz ibn Jābir ⁴⁶	Zayd ibn Ḥāritha	SS 1-2:601.6
4. Jumādā II 2	Dhū ʾl-ʿUshayra ⁴⁷	Abū Salama ibn ʿAbd al-Asad	SS 1-2:598.16
5a. Ramaḍān 2	Badr al-qitāl ⁴⁸	ʿAmr ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 1-2:612.14
5b. Ramaḍān 2	Badr al-qitāl	Abū Lubāba ⁴⁹	SS 1-2:612.15
6. Shawwāl 2	Qaynuqāʿ ⁵⁰	Bashīr ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhir ⁵¹	SS 3-4:49.2
7. Dhū ʾl-Ḥijja 2	Sawīq	Bashīr ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhir ⁵²	SS 3-4:45.3
8. Muḥarram 3	Kudr ⁵³	Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfaṭa al-Ghifārī Ibn Umm Maktūm ⁵⁴	SS 3-4:43.14
9. Rabīʿ I 3	Dhū Amarr	ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān	SS 3-4:46.8
10. Jumādā I 3	Buḥrān ⁵⁵	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:46.12
11. Shawwāl 3	Uḥud	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:64.1
12. Shawwāl 3	Ḥamrāʾ al-Asad	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:102.1
13. Rabīʿ I 4	Banū ʾl-Naḍīr	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:190.22
14. Dhū ʾl-Qaʿda 4	Badr al-Mawʿid ⁵⁶	ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy ⁵⁷	SS 3-4:209.15

45. For Ibn Ishāq’s statement that their number was twenty-seven, and his list of them, see SS 3-4:608.13 = SG 659f. Caetani in his chronological digest of early Islamic history gives a list of deputies for eighteen of Muḥammad’s expeditions (*Annali*, 2:1:523f n. 2, with cross-references to his accounts of the individual expeditions); he follows Ibn Hishām closely,

46. Here Safawān or Badr al-ʿUlā (SS 1-2:601.2, 601.9 = SG 286).

47. Here ʿUshayra (SS 1-2:598.14, 599.7, 599.14 = SG 285).

48. Here Badr al-kubrā (SS 1-2:606.6 = SG 289).

49. For Abū Lubāba, in addition to SS 1-2:612.15 = SG 292 and 738 no. 354, see SS 1-2:688.16 = SG 331. The first is from Ibn Hishām, the second from Ibn Ishāq. It is presumably the second that has a parallel in the Rāzī transmission of his work noted by Mughultāy ibn Qilij (*al-Zahr al-bāsim*, 907.6, where Salama is Salama ibn al-Faḍl al-Rāzī). Mughultāy also mentions that Mūsā ibn ʿUqba (d. 141/758f) said the same (907.12), and repeats it in his *Ishāra*, 200.6; this is confirmed by a report from Mūsā found in Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 403 no. 1203, where Mūsā transmits from Zuhri. Incidentally, the report immediately following (no. 1204) may be an early attestation of knowledge of Ibn Hishām’s work in the east. For the possibly distinct roles of Ibn Umm Maktūm and Abū Lubāba see the first subsection of section 4.3 below.

50. Here Banū Qaynuqāʿ (SS 3-4:47.1 = SG 363).

51. That is Abū Lubāba.

52. Adding *wa-huwa Abū Lubāba*.

53. Here Ghazwat Banī Sulaym biʾl-Kudr (SS 3-4:43.11 = SG 360).

54. The two are given as alternatives with no expression of preference, though the order would suggest that Sibāʿ is the preferred candidate.

55. Here Ghazwat al-Furuʿ min Buḥrān (SS 3-4:46.11 = SG 362; Furuʿ is so vocalized at 46.14).

56. Here Ghazwat Badr al-ākhirā (SS 3-4:209.10 = SG 447).

57. Adding the name of Ubayy’s mother Salūl and the *nisba* al-Anṣārī.

15. Muḥarram 5	Dhāt al-Riqā ^c	Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī (‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān) ⁵⁸	SS 3-4:203.14
16. Rabī ^c I 5	Dūmat al-Jandal	Sibā ^c ibn ‘Urfuṭa al-Ghifārī	SS 3-4:213.16
17. Sha‘bān 5	Muraysi ^{c59}	Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī (Numayla ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī) ⁶⁰	SS 3-4:289.11
18. Dhū ‘l-Qa‘da 5	Khandaq	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:220.6
19. Dhū ‘l-Qa‘da 5	Banū Qurayza	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:234.5
20. Rabī ^c I 6	Banū Liḥyān	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:279.10
21. Rabī ^c II 6	Ghāba ⁶¹	Ibn Umm Maktūm	SS 3-4:284.15
22. Dhū ‘l-Qa‘da 6	Ḥudaybiya	Numayla ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī	SS 3-4:308.8
23. Jumādā I 7	Khaybar	Numayla ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī	SS 3-4:328.8
24. Dhū ‘l-Qa‘da 7	‘Umrāt al-qaḍiyya ⁶²	‘Uwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Du‘alī	SS 3-4:370.12
25. Ramaḍān 8	Fatḥ, etc.	Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī ⁶³	SS 3-4:399.21
26. Rajab 9	Tabūk	Muḥammad ibn Maslama al-Anṣārī (Sibā ^c ibn ‘Urfuṭa) ⁶⁴	SS 3-4:519.9
27. Dhū ‘l-Ḥijja 10	Ḥajjat Rasūl Allāh ⁶⁵	Abū Dujāna al-Sā‘idī (Sibā ^c ibn ‘Urfuṭa al-Ghifārī) ⁶⁶	SS 3-4:601.11

The third list is provided by Khalīfa in his *Ta’rīkh*.⁶⁷ It gives information for only

58. ‘Uthmān is mentioned with the formula “it is said”.

59. Here Ghazwat Banī ‘l-Muṣṭaliq (SS 3-4:289.6 = SG 490).

60. Numayla is mentioned with the formula “it is said”.

61. Here Ghazwat Dhī Qarad (SS 3-4:281.2 = SG 486; cf. SS 281.6, 281.12).

62. Here ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ (SS 3-4:370.4 = SG 530).

63. Giving his name as Kulthūm ibn Ḥuṣayn ibn ‘Utba ibn Khalaf. Unusually, the naming of the deputy comes not from Ibn Hishām but rather from a tradition going back to ‘Abdallāh ibn al-‘Abbās and transmitted by Ibn Ishāq; that this cannot be an unmarked interpolation of Ibn Hishām’s is shown by the parallel in the Ḥarrānī transmission of Ibn Ishāq’s work (see Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 2388 no. 5848; for the Ḥarrānī transmitters Muḥammad ibn Salama and Abū Ja‘far al-Nufaylī see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 25:289–91 and 16:88–92 respectively). Oddly, Abū Nu‘aym elsewhere describes Sibā^c ibn ‘Urfuṭa as *‘āmil al-Nabī ‘alā ‘l-Madīna ‘ām Ḥunayn* (*Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 1451.12).

64. After mentioning Muḥammad ibn Maslama, Ibn Hishām goes on to quote the father of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad al-Darāwardī to the effect that the deputy was Sibā^c ibn ‘Urfuṭa (SS 3-4:519.10 = SG 783 no. 860). Ṭabarī, by contrast, attributes this information to Ibn Ishāq (Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, I/1696.4 = *History*, 9:51; for his line of transmission from Ibn Ishāq see below, note 87). Ibn ‘Asākir, however, attributes the statement that Muḥammad appointed Muḥammad ibn Maslama to Ibn Ishāq (*Ta’rīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Shīrī, 2:31.1; his transmitter from Ibn Ishāq is Yūnus, that is the Kūfan Yūnus ibn Bukayr (d. 199/814f), see 23.18).

65. Here Ḥajjat al-wadā^c (SS 3-4:601.4 = SG 649).

66. Sibā^c is mentioned with the formula “it is said”.

67. Khalīfa, *Ta’rīkh*, 61.9. In his narrative coverage of the expeditions (13–58) he only mentions one deputy appointed over Medina, namely Muḥammad ibn Maslama at the time of the expedition to Kudr (16.8). He ascribes this information to Ibn Ishāq, whose work he knows in two Baṣran transmissions (see 8.7); it does not appear in Ibn Hishām’s recension (SS 3-4:43.12), nor in the Rāzī transmission quoted by Ṭabarī (*Ta’rīkh*, I/1363.11 = *History*, 7:88).

nineteen of the expeditions.⁶⁸ Again I take Wāqidī's listing of the expeditions and their dates as a template, and substitute the names of the deputies as given by Khalīfa.⁶⁹ Note that he states that Ibn Umm Maktūm was deputy for thirteen expeditions, but in the text as we have it he only names twelve of them.⁷⁰

1. Şafar 2	Waddān	Ibn Umm Maktūm
2. Rabīʿ I 2	Buwāṭ	Ibn Umm Maktūm
3. Rabīʿ I 2	Kurz ibn Jābir	Ibn Umm Maktūm
4. Jumādā II 2	Dhū ʿl-ʿUshayra	Ibn Umm Maktūm
5a. Ramaḍān 2	Badr al-qitāl	Ibn Umm Maktūm
5b. Ramaḍān 2	Badr al-qitāl	Abū Lubāba
6. Shawwāl 2	Qaynuqāʿ	—
7. Dhū ʿl-Ḥijja 2	Sawīq	Ibn Umm Maktūm
8. Muḥarram 3	Kudr	Muḥammad ibn Maslama
9. Rabīʿ I 3	Dhū Amarr	Ibn Umm Maktūm
10. Jumādā I 3	Buḥrān	Ibn Umm Maktūm
11. Shawwāl 3	Uḥud	Ibn Umm Maktūm
12. Shawwāl 3	Ḥamrāʾ al-Asad	Ibn Umm Maktūm
13. Rabīʿ I 4	Banū ʿl-Naḍīr	—
14. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 4	Badr al-Mawʿid	—
15. Muḥarram 5	Dhāt al-Riqāʿ	Ibn Umm Maktūm
16. Rabīʿ I 5	Dūmat al-Jandal	—
17. Shaʿbān 5	Muraysīʿ	Numayla ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī
18. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 5	Khandaq	—
19. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 5	Banū Qurayza	—
20. Rabīʿ I 6	Banū Liḥyān	—
21. Rabīʿ II 6	Ghāba	—
22. Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda 6	Ḥudaybiya	ʿUwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ of the Banū al-Duʿil

68. Compare the traditions according to which the number of Muḥammad's expeditions was nineteen (Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaf*, ed. Laḥḥām, 8:467 nos. 1–3, 5). In Khalīfa's narrative of events I count twenty-two expeditions.

69. I also take for granted the alternative names of expeditions already noted. Khalīfa refers to Kudr as Qarqarat al-Kudr in his list (*Taʿrīkh*, 61.15), though not in his actual account of the expedition (16.3); for this variant form of the name see W 182 n. 4.

70. Whether or not the discrepancy goes back to Khalīfa himself, it is old: the part of Khalīfa's list relating to Ibn Umm Maktūm is reproduced by Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) in one of his biographical entries on him (*Istīʿāb*, 1198f no. 1946), and the same discrepancy appears. Here the passage is prefixed with the words "he came to Medina a little after Badr" and apparently ascribed to Wāqidī (1198.15). This ascription of the passage should be disregarded, among other things because the prefixed words and the list of expeditions are incompatible: if Ibn Umm Maktūm only came to Medina a little after Badr, then he could not have acted as deputy for the first four expeditions. Compare also the way the prefixed words are continued in Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr's other entry on Ibn Umm Maktūm (997.11), and the unattributed parallel in Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 4:1:150.25.

23. Jumādā I 7	Khaybar	Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī
24. Dhū 'l-Qa'da 7	‘Umrat al-qaḍiyya	Abū Ruhm
25. Ramaḍān 8	Fath, etc.	Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī Kulthūm ibn Ḥuṣayn
26. Rajab 9	Tabūk	Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa al-Ghifārī
27. Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 10	Ḥajjat Rasūl Allāh	Ibn Umm Maktūm

Khalīfa adds that Ghālīb ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī served as deputy at the time of some unspecified expedition or expeditions of the Prophet (*fī ba‘d ghazawātihi*); this can perhaps be identified as that against the Banū Liḥyān.⁷¹ In any case I will include Ghālīb in what follows.

As will become cumulatively evident, posterity paid a lot of attention to the data given by Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām. Khalīfa’s contribution, by contrast, seems to have had little impact.⁷²

2.3 Other relatively early sources for Muḥammad’s deputies

There are, of course, many other sources that provide information on Muḥammad’s deputies, but my impression is that, while they offer us occasional points of interest, they mostly tend to repeat the data of Wāqidi or Ibn Hishām without telling us anything new. I treat here sources of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, and relegate later sources to an appendix.

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845), in his account of the expeditions led by Muḥammad, in general names deputies identical to those given by Wāqidi⁷³—no surprise given his close connection to him.⁷⁴ But he does contribute a finer point. The reader may (or may not) recollect that with regard to the expedition to Tabūk (no. 26), Wāqidi confuses us: he names the deputy as Ibn Umm Maktūm in one place, as Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa in another, and in both places adds that it is also said that it was Muḥammad ibn Maslama. Here Ibn Sa‘d gives us his own opinion on the question, in apparent disagreement with Wāqidi: he tells us that the deputy was Muḥammad ibn Maslama, adding that in his opinion this view is more to be relied on than any alternative.⁷⁵ In his biographical entries he sometimes tells us that the person in

71. Khalīfa, *Ta’rīkh*, 61.18. Ibn al-Kalbī states that Muḥammad appointed him deputy for the Liḥyān expedition (no. 20; *Jamharat al-nasab*, 142.2).

72. For a possible exception, see Ibn al-Athīr, *Usd al-ghāba*, 4:330.23, where it is stated that Muḥammad ibn Maslama served as deputy for an expedition that some say was Qarqarat al-Kudr (no. 8); neither Wāqidi nor Ibn Hishām says this, but Khalīfa does.

73. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:1–136. Except for Tabūk the only departure is the Ḥajjat al-wadā‘, for which he does not name a deputy (124–36). For the Fath he agrees with Wāqidi in naming the deputy as Ibn Umm Maktūm (97.20), but later quotes a tradition that would place him with the expedition (102.4).

74. *IE*², art. “Ibn Sa‘d” (J. W. Fück).

75. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:119.17 (*wa-huwa athbat ‘indānā mimman qāla ‘stakhlafa ghayrahu*). In his biography of Muḥammad ibn Maslama he has him as deputy without any qualification (3:2:19.8, 19.17). Though not found in Wāqidi’s work as we have it, it could be that this in fact goes back to him (see above, note 43).

question served as deputy, and the information he provides there regularly agrees with what he has told us in his account of the expeditions.⁷⁶

Another author who has something to offer is Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/860) in his chapter on people on whom Muḥammad conferred authority (*umarāʾ Rasūl Allāh*).⁷⁷ Here, in a mixed bag made up mostly of what we might call provincial governors, he names those whom Muḥammad appointed over Medina for four (and only four) expeditions. The first is Ḥudaybiya (no. 22), for which Ibn Ḥabīb names Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī,⁷⁸ in disagreement with all three of our authors, but, as will shortly be seen, in agreement with Balādhurī's mention of an alternative. The second is Khaybar (no. 23), for which he names Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī,⁷⁹ in agreement with Wāqidi; he adds that it is also said that it was Abū Ruhm, in agreement with Khalīfa. The third is the Faṭḥ (no. 25), for which he again names Abū Ruhm,⁸⁰ in agreement with Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa. The fourth is Tabūk (no. 26), for which he names ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib,⁸¹ whom we here encounter as a deputy for the first time.

76. The only further discrepancy concerns Ibn Umm Maktūm, who he tells us was deputy for Badr (Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:151.14, a Kūfan tradition from a Raqqan source; contrast 2:1:6.23). This agrees with Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa.

77. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 125–8.

78. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 127.1.

79. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 127.2. That his name appears in the text as Subayʿ is likely to be a copyist's error.

80. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 127.4.

81. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 125.16. That Muḥammad appointed ʿAlī as the deputy over Medina (*istakhlafa ʿAliyyan ʿalā ʾl-Madīna*) for Tabūk is already explicitly stated in what looks like a Baṣran tradition from Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ preserved by ʿAbd al-Razzāq (*Muṣannaf*, 11:226 no. 20,390; contrast 2:395 no. 3828, where the deputy is named as Ibn Umm Maktūm). This is to be compared with what Ibn Ishāq tells us: ʿAlī was left behind to look after Muḥammad's family, for which he was mocked by the Hypocrites (SS 3-4:519.17 = SG 604). Other versions of the tradition have an air of equivocating between these two views. Thus the text given by Ibn Saʿd says only that Muḥammad left ʿAlī behind in Medina (*khallafahu biʾl-Madīna*, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:1:15.8), not that he made him deputy over it; likewise a version in Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* does not specify over what ʿAlī was appointed (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 5-6:309 no. 857 = *maghāzī* 80; the reference to women and children is compatible with either view). In this tradition ʿAlī is upset at being left behind, to which Muḥammad replies: "Are you not satisfied to have the same status (*manzila*) in relation to me as Aaron had in relation to Moses, except that there is no prophet after me?" The reference is to Q7:142, where Moses, before going to speak with God, tells Aaron: "Be my deputy among my people (*ukhlufnī fī qawmī*), and put things right (*aṣliḥ*), and do not follow the way of the workers of corruption." Though the verse does not use the noun *khalīfa*, the term is regularly employed by the exegetes to gloss *ukhlufnī* as *kun khalīfatī*, "Be my deputy" (Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 6:49.3; Abū ʿl-Layth al-Samarqandī, *Tafsīr*, 1:567.15; Zamakhsharī, *Kashshāf*, 2:500.21; Ṭabrisī, *Majmaʿ al-bayān*, 2:473.21; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Tafsīr*, 14:227.10, all to Q7:142). The verb *istakhlafa* likewise appears in references to Aaron's role as deputy; thus Ṭabarī in his history says of Moses that he *istakhlafa Hārūn ʿalā Banī Isrāʾīl* ("made Aaron his deputy over the Children of Israel", *Taʾrīkh*, I/489.9 = *History*, 3:72; similarly Thaʿlabī, *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, 184.5, and Qummī, *Tafsīr*, 1:241.19 to Q7:142; for the noun *istikhlāf* in this context see Ṭabrisī, *Majmaʿ al-bayān*, 2:473.29). Yet the role of ʿAlī as deputy for the Tabūk expedition is to my knowledge the only context in which the Mosaic model is invoked with regard to Muḥammad's deputies, and I have seen no echo of the Koranic use of the verb *aṣlahā* to describe the duties of a deputy. Altogether, the identification of ʿAlī as deputy for Tabūk could be tendentious (a view firmly adopted by Caetani, see *Annali*, 2:1:245, where he says of the story "la sua natura apocripha è più che manifesta"), and we are clearly in the thick of early sectarian tensions. But I suspect that the sources I cite here are as yet innocent of the Imāmī argument that the fact that the Prophet appointed ʿAlī his deputy (*istakhlafahu*) over Medina implies that he was to be his successor

In sum:

22. Ḥudaybiya	Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī
23. Khaybar	Sibā ^c ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī
25. Faṭḥ, etc.	Abū Ruhm
26. Tabūk	ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib

The case is similar with Balādhurī (d. 279/892f).⁸² His data are identical with those provided by Wāqidī except for a cluster of five expeditions in years 6 to 9 (nos. 22-26 in the lists above).⁸³ They are as follows (with alternatives in parentheses):

22. Ḥudaybiya	Ibn Umm Maktūm (Abū Ruhm Kulthūm ibn al-Ḥuṣayn al-Ghifārī)
23. Khaybar	Sibā ^c ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Kinānī (Numayla ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Kinānī)
24. ʿUmrat al-qaḍiyya	Abū Dharr Jundab ibn Junāda al-Ghifārī (ʿUwayf ibn Rabīʿa ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Kinānī)
25. Faṭḥ, etc.	Ibn Umm Maktūm (Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī)
26. Tabūk	Ibn Umm Maktūm (Muhammad ibn Maslama al-Anṣārī, Abū Ruhm, Sibā ^c ibn ʿUrfuṭa)

As can be seen by comparing this list with Wāqidī's, in one case—the ʿUmrat al-qaḍāʾ—Balādhurī does not mention the (preferred) deputy named by Wāqidī, but in the other four cases he does, putting him first. In each case, however, he cites at least one alternative. Two of the three alternatives he names for Tabūk are also mentioned by Wāqidī. At the same time, five of Balādhurī's alternatives for these expeditions are mentioned by Ibn Hishām. In two cases Balādhurī tells us something we have not heard before: in naming Abū Ruhm as an alternative for Tabūk, and in naming Abū Dharr as the (preferred) deputy for the ʿUmrat al-qaḍiyya. Like Ibn Hishām and Ibn Saʿd, Balādhurī takes the view that Muḥammad ibn Maslama is the deputy of choice for Tabūk.⁸⁴

Yaʿqūbī (d. 284/897f) does not generally bother to name deputies, but on two occasions he does so: the Faṭḥ (no. 25) and Tabūk (no. 26). For the Faṭḥ he gives the deputy as Abū Lubāba ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhir—already familiar to us as a deputy, but only for early

(*khalīfatuhu*) after his death (al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, ed. Sālim, 169.1; for Shīʿite use of the appointment and the *ḥadīth al-manzila* in this connection, see Mufīd, *Irshād*, 1:154–8 = trans. Howard, 106–9; Miskinzoda, “Significance of the *ḥadīth* of the position of Aaron”, especially 72, 76f).

82. For his coverage of Muḥammad's expeditions see Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 287–371.

83. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 350.21, 352.11, 352.22, 353.11, 364.13, 368.17. One might have expected disagreement to be more frequent for the earlier years, and especially for the minor raids of those years. There must be some relationship between the treatments of this cluster by Ibn Ḥabīb and Balādhurī, but I don't know what it is.

84. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 368.19. For Ibn Saʿd, see above, note 75.

expeditions.⁸⁵ For Tabūk, like Ibn Ḥabīb, he identifies ‘Alī as the deputy.⁸⁶

The major sources used by Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) for the expeditions led by Muḥammad are Wāqidī and Ibn Ishāq.⁸⁷ He specifies the deputy for just over half the expeditions, and the names he provides regularly agree with those given by Wāqidī, whom he often identifies as his source. But on two occasions he states that he owes his information about the deputy to Ibn Ishāq. One is the Fath (no. 25), where he identifies the deputy as Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī, quoting on the authority of Ibn Ishāq the same tradition that we find in Ibn Hishām’s work.⁸⁸ The other is Tabūk (no. 26), for which Ṭabarī quotes Ibn Ishāq naming the deputy as Sibā‘ ibn ‘Urfuṭa;⁸⁹ this does not appear in Ibn Hishām’s transmission, though he quotes a tradition from another source to the same effect.⁹⁰

Mas‘ūdī (d. 345/956) in one of his works gives an account of Muḥammad’s life that includes his expeditions.⁹¹ Except in two instances he names the deputies, and except in four instances these names agree with those given by Wāqidī. The four instances where there is divergence are Dūmat al-Jandal (no. 16), for which Mas‘ūdī names Ibn Umm Maktūm;⁹² Banū Qurayza (no. 19), for which he names Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī;⁹³ the ‘Umrat al-qaḍā’ (no. 24), for which he names Sibā‘ ibn ‘Urfuṭa;⁹⁴ and Tabūk (no. 26), for which he names ‘Alī, adding that others say it was Abū Ruhm, Ibn Umm Maktūm, Muḥammad ibn Maslama, or Sibā‘ ibn ‘Urfuṭa, and then commenting that the best view (*al-ashhar*) is that it was ‘Alī.⁹⁵ I have not seen parallels for the first three of these expeditions; for Tabūk, as we have seen, ‘Alī is named by Ibn Ḥabīb and Ya‘qūbī, and all the others are mentioned at least by Balādhurī.

Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) has an extended biography of the Prophet at the beginning of one of his works.⁹⁶ In the course of this he gives the names of the deputies for about three-quarters of Muḥammad’s expeditions, and these names agree with those found in Wāqidī in all but two cases. The first of these is unremarkable: for the Fath (no. 25) he names Abū

85. Ya‘qūbī, *Ta’rīkh*, ed. Houtsma, 2:59.4.

86. Ya‘qūbī, *Ta’rīkh*, ed. Houtsma, 2:70.5.

87. The lines of transmission by which he received their works are different from those by which we have them. Our transmitter of Wāqidī’s *Maghāzī* is Muḥammad ibn Shujā‘ al-Thaljī (d. 266/880), whereas Ṭabarī’s is Muḥammad ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845). The key figure in our transmission of Ibn Ishāq’s life of Muḥammad is the Egyptian Ibn Hishām (d. 218/833), whereas the transmitters to Ṭabarī are the Rāzīs Salama ibn al-Faḍl (d. after 190/805) and Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd (d. 248/862f).

88. Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, I/1627.14 = *History*, 8:168; SS 3-4:399.19 = SG 545.

89. Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, I/1696.4 = *History*, 9:51.

90. SS 3-4:519.10 = SG 783 n. 860.

91. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 202–43.

92. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 215.6.

93. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 217.8.

94. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 228.6.

95. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 235.20, 236.4.

96. Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, 1:14–2:151.

Ruhm al-Ghifārī,⁹⁷ in agreement with Ibn Ishāq, Khalīfa, and others. The second is new to us: for the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ he names Nājiya ibn Jundab al-Aslamī, whom I have not seen mentioned as a deputy in any other source; this could well be an error.⁹⁸

I will leave aside the data provided by these and later sources in my main analysis, though I will cite them occasionally in particular connections. It is worth noting that these seven relatively early sources provide us with only two names of deputies that are absent from the data provided by Wāqidi, Ibn Hishām, and Khalīfa: ‘Alī and Nājiya ibn Jundab.

2.4 The extent of agreement between the three major sources

How far do our three major sources agree on the information they provide?

Let us begin with the two full lists, that provided by Wāqidi and that derived from Ibn

97. Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, 2:42.7.

98. Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, 2: 26.4. Nājiya ibn Jundab is not well-known, but neither is he a complete nonentity (for his biography see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1522f no. 2650; Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:44.22, 45.6). His name and that of his father appear in a variety of forms (thus Wāqidi sometimes refers to him as Nājiya ibn al-A‘jam, see for example W 587.11, and contrast the following line, while Ibn Sa‘d treats the latter as a distinct person), but his tribal affiliation is clear: he belonged to Aslam (T201), yet another of the local tribes of the Ḥijāz (see *EP*, art. “Khuzā‘a” (M. J. Kister), 78b for their early alliance with Muḥammad), and within it to the clan of Sahm. As a deputy he would thus be similar to our various Kinānīs. He himself is not found in T201, but he would belong there as a descendant of Dārim ibn ‘Itr. He died in Medina in the reign of Mu‘āwiya (ruled 41–60/661–80), and is known mainly for two things. The first is that Muḥammad would put him in charge of his sacrificial animals when taking or sending them to Mecca for the pilgrimage (for al-Ḥudaybiya see W 572.15, 575.3, and Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:44.24; for the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ see W 732.16, Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:87.19, 4:2:45.1, and Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 353.8; for the pilgrimage led by Abū Bakr see W 1077.5, and Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:121.18; for the Ḥajjāt al-wadā‘ see W 1090.18, 1091.1, and Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:124.19, 4:2:45.3). The second is that at a thirsty moment on the expedition to Ḥudaybiya, Muḥammad sent a man down a well to poke around with an arrow and thereby release a supply of water; his fellow-tribesmen later claimed that Nājiya was the one in question, and convincingly backed this up with some snappy verses exchanged between him and a slave-girl while he was working at the bottom of the well (W 587.8; SS 3-4:310.10 = SG 501; and see Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:45.9). He has no record of military deeds in our sources, but he boasts of being a warrior in these and other verses (for his verses spoken at Khaybar see W 701.5; SS 3-4:348.11 = SG 521); moreover he carried one of the two standards of Aslam at the Faṭḥ (W 800.17, 819.11, and Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:178.24, 4:2:45.13). Ibn Sa‘d informs us that he had no descendants (4:2:45.16), but Wāqidi tells us that he owes his knowledge of the verses spoken at the well and at Khaybar to a descendant of Nājiya’s called ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Wahb (W 588.3, 701.8). As pointed out to me by Michael Lecker, Wāqidi was himself a *mawlā* of Aslam, and specifically of Sahm (see *EP*, art. “al-Wāqidi” (S. Leder), and W 5 of the editor’s introduction); this connection may have eased his access to such information and boosted Nājiya’s reputation. Returning to Nājiya’s alleged role as deputy, it will be apparent that Ibn Ḥibbān’s statement that Nājiya was deputy for the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ conflicts with several sources that have him in charge of the sacrificial animals on that occasion. In fact the text of Ibn Ḥibbān reads at this point, speaking of Muḥammad: *thumma aḥrama wa-sāqa sab‘in badana fī sab‘imi‘at rajul, wa-‘sta‘mala ‘alā ‘l-Madīna Nājiya ibn Jundab al-Aslamī (Thiqāt, 2:26.4)*. Given the immediately preceding reference to sacrificial animals, it is likely enough that at some point in the transmission of the text *‘alā ‘l-budn* was corrupted to *‘alā ‘l-Madīna* in this sentence, perhaps by a scribe who was expecting a statement about the appointment of a deputy (the use of *ista‘mala* with regard to oversight of sacrificial animals is in place, see, for example, W 572.16, 1077.7).

Hishām. Comparing the tables given above, we see that the two agree unambiguously on sixteen of the twenty-seven expeditions,⁹⁹ and disagree unambiguously on eight.¹⁰⁰ In between, they are in ambiguous agreement on the remaining three—that is to say, in each of these cases Ibn Hishām, and in one case also Wāqidī, give alternatives, and at least one of the alternatives is shared.¹⁰¹ In tabular form:

WĀQIDĪ AND IBN HISHĀM:

unambiguous agreement: 16
ambiguous agreement: 3
unambiguous disagreement: 8

Total: 27

How does Khalīfa's list compare? Here the comparison is only for nineteen expeditions—call it twenty to include the case of the deputy whom Khalīfa adds to his list without specifying an expedition. Within these twenty, as regards Khalīfa and Wāqidī, we have unambiguous agreement in six cases,¹⁰² ambiguous agreement in one,¹⁰³ and unambiguous disagreement in thirteen cases.¹⁰⁴ As regards Khalīfa and Ibn Hishām, we have unambiguous agreement in five cases,¹⁰⁵ ambiguous agreement in two,¹⁰⁶ and unambiguous disagreement in thirteen cases.¹⁰⁷ Among these there are two expeditions for which Khalīfa agrees ambiguously or unambiguously with Ibn Hishām against Wāqidī.¹⁰⁸ In tabular form:

KHALĪFA AND WĀQIDĪ:

unambiguous agreement: 6
ambiguous agreement: 1
unambiguous disagreement: 13

Total: 20

99. Nos. 1, 3–7 (but not 5a), 9–13, 16, 18–21.

100. Nos. 2, 14, 17, 22–25, 27. It is again surprising that disagreements are most frequent in the later rather than the early years.

101. Nos. 8, 15, 26. In the first and second cases it is the second name given by Ibn Hishām that is shared; in the third case it is his first name and Wāqidī's second.

102. Nos. 5/5b, 10–12, 24, 27.

103. No. 26. In this case Khalīfa shares the first name given by Wāqidī in his account of the expedition, though not in his introductory list.

104. Nos. 1–4, 7–9, 15, 17, 22–23, 25, plus the case of Ghālib. Khalīfa's naming of Ghālib constitutes an unambiguous disagreement irrespective of which expedition he might be assigned to, since Ibn Hishām and Wāqidī do not name him for any expedition.

105. Nos. 5a–b, 10–12, 25.

106. Nos. 17, 26. In each case the agreement is with Ibn Hishām's second name.

107. Nos. 1–4, 7–9, 15, 22–24, 27.

108. No. 17 is a case of ambiguous agreement, and no. 25 is a case of unambiguous agreement.

KHALĪFA AND IBN HISHĀM:

unambiguous agreement: 5
 ambiguous agreement: 2
 unambiguous disagreement: 13

Total: 20

If we compare all three, we see that there are four cases of unambiguous agreement across the board,¹⁰⁹ one of ambiguous agreement,¹¹⁰ and sixteen of unambiguous disagreement.¹¹¹ That leaves six cases where Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām agree but Khalīfa is silent.¹¹² In tabular form:

ALL THREE SOURCES:

unambiguous agreement: 4
 ambiguous agreement: 1
 unambiguous disagreement: 16
 agreement but Khalīfa is silent: 6

Total: 27

There are a couple of curious points to note here about Ibn Umm Maktūm. First, Khalīfa's statement that he served as deputy for thirteen expeditions (though he only names twelve) is not isolated. There is also a Kūfan tradition from Sha'bi (d. 104/722f) to the same effect.¹¹³ Moreover, the number of expeditions for which Wāqidī assigns Ibn Umm Maktūm as deputy is thirteen, though one case is ambiguous.¹¹⁴ So there is a notable

109. Nos. 5b, 10–12.

110. No. 26.

111. In nos. 1–4, 7–9, 15, 17, 22–25, and 27, plus the case of Ghālib, Khalīfa is in disagreement with one or both of the other authors. In no. 14 Khalīfa is silent, but Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām disagree. I leave aside no. 5a, where Khalīfa agrees with Ibn Hishām but Wāqidī is silent.

112. Nos. 6, 13, 16, 18–21. This totals seven, but one of them is presumably the expedition to which Ghālib would be assigned.

113. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:151.3. The transmitter from Sha'bi and to the Wāsiṭī Yazīd ibn Hārūn (d. 206/821) is the Kūfan Muḥammad ibn Sālim al-Hamdānī (for whom see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 25:238–42). The expeditions in question are not named. Note also the statement of al-Haytham ibn 'Adī (d. c. 206/821) that Muḥammad appointed Ibn Umm Maktūm deputy over Medina for most of his expeditions (*fī akthar ghazawātihi*, see Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. al-'Azm, 9:276.3); see also 'Abd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 2:395 no. 3829 (the Prophet would appoint Ibn Umm Maktūm deputy over Medina when he was traveling).

114. Nos. 8, 10–13, 18–22, 25–27; the ambiguous case is no. 26 (Tabūk). Ibn Sa'd in his biography of Ibn Umm Maktūm quotes a list transmitted by Wāqidī of the expeditions for which he served as deputy (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.25). Here twelve expeditions are listed (actually eleven, since Ghāba and Dhū Qarad are the same expedition), viz. nos. 8–13, 18–22; in comparison with the list given by Wāqidī in his *Maghāzī*, this omits nos. 25–27, but adds no. 9, for which he there names 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān as deputy. Ibn Hishām names Ibn Umm Maktūm as deputy in only ten cases, one of them ambiguous (nos. 5a, 8, 10–13, 18–21; the ambiguous case is no. 8).

agreement here between Khalīfa and Wāqidī. And yet when it comes to naming the expeditions in question, the agreement largely dissolves: they agree on only four cases,¹¹⁵ and disagree on eight.¹¹⁶ This might suggest that the number thirteen came first, and that the attempts to identify the thirteen expeditions came later. Second, there is a Baṣran tradition from Qatāda ibn Di‘āma (d. 117/735f) that says something very different: that the Prophet appointed Ibn Umm Maktūm as his deputy over Medina twice¹¹⁷—and no more. It is not isolated, for we have the same information from the Khurasanian exegete Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Muzāḥim (d. 105/723f).¹¹⁸

2.5 The pool of deputies

One thing—not the only thing—we can do with the lists of deputies discussed above is to merge their data to produce a pool of deputies, that is to say, a list of all the men who are said by any of our three main sources to have served in this role. In the list that follows, the numbers identify the expeditions for which each author names the man in question as deputy. Where an author provides an alternative name, the one he prefers is marked with a single question mark (“26?”), the other with two (“26??”). Here is the pool, a total of eighteen names, in alphabetical order:

‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn Ubayy

Wāqidī:

Ibn Hishām: 14

Khalīfa:

‘Abdallāh ibn Rawāḥa

Wāqidī: 14

Ibn Hishām:

Khalīfa:

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī

Wāqidī: 23??

Ibn Hishām: 15?, 17?

115. Nos. 10–12, 27.

116. Nos. 1–4, 5a, 7, 9, 15.

117. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:151.10. The transmitter from Qatāda and to the Baṣran ‘Amr ibn ‘Āṣim (d. 213/828f) is the Baṣran Hammām ibn Yaḥyā (d. 164/781). For Hammām, see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 30:302–10, and for ‘Amr ibn ‘Āṣim, see 22:87–90. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (*Istī‘āb*, 1199.6 no. 1946) quotes the tradition from Qatāda from the Baṣran Companion Anas ibn Mālīk (d. 91/709f), noting that he cannot have heard what others had heard (sc. about the number of times Ibn Umm Maktūm served as deputy)—though God knows best. The tradition is also found in Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, 3:131 no. 2931 (*al-kharāj wa’l-imāra wa’l-fay’* 3), and in Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 12:444 no. 36,322, where it forms part of an exegesis of Q80:1–2; the *isnāds* are solidly Baṣran (for Ṭabarī’s see Horst, “Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar aṭ-Ṭabarīs”, 301).

118. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.21, in an exegesis of Q80:1–2. The transmitter from Ḍaḥḥāk and to Yazīd ibn Hārūn is Juwaybir ibn Sa‘īd al-Azdī, a Balkhī who was reckoned among the Kūfans (see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 5:167–71). This tradition also appears in Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 12:444 no. 36,325, where the transmitter from Ḍaḥḥāk is ‘Ubayd ibn Sulaymān al-Bāhilī, a Kūfan who settled in Marw (see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 19:212f) and in turn transmits to a Marwazī (see Horst, “Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar aṭ-Ṭabarīs”, 304).

- Khalīfa:
Abū Dujāna al-Sāʿidī
Wāqidī:
Ibn Hishām: 27?
Khalīfa:
Abū Lubāba Bashīr ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhir al-ʿAmrī
Wāqidī: 5, 6, 7
Ibn Hishām: 5b, 6, 7
Khalīfa: 5b
Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī
Wāqidī: 24
Ibn Hishām: 25
Khalīfa: 23, 24, 25
Abū Salama ibn ʿAbd al-Asad
Wāqidī: 4
Ibn Hishām: 4
Khalīfa:
Ghālib ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī
Wāqidī:
Ibn Hishām:
Khalīfa: unspecified
Ibn Umm Maktūm al-Maʿīṣī
Wāqidī: 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26?, 27
Ibn Hishām: 5a, 8??, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21
Khalīfa: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5a, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 27
Muḥammad ibn Maslama al-Ashhalī
Wāqidī: 26??
Ibn Hishām: 26?
Khalīfa: 8
Numayla ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī
Wāqidī:
Ibn Hishām: 17??, 22, 23
Khalīfa: 17
Saʿd ibn Muʿādh
Wāqidī: 2
Ibn Hishām:
Khalīfa:
Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda
Wāqidī: 1
Ibn Hishām: 1
Khalīfa:
Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn
Wāqidī:

Ibn Hishām: 2
Khalīfa:
Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī
Wāqidī: 16, 23?, 26?
Ibn Hishām: 8?, 16, 26??, 27??
Khalīfa: 26
ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān
Wāqidī: 9, 15
Ibn Hishām: 9, 15??
Khalīfa:
ʿUwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Duʿalī
Wāqidī:
Ibn Hishām: 24
Khalīfa: 22
Zayd ibn Ḥāritha
Wāqidī: 3, 17
Ibn Hishām: 3
Khalīfa:

Of these eighteen names, two are peculiar to Wāqidī, three to Ibn Hishām, and one to Khalīfa. Five are shared by Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām but not Khalīfa, two by Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa but not Wāqidī, and none by Wāqidī and Khalīfa but not Ibn Hishām. Only five are shared by all three authors. Yet if we set aside Khalīfa’s list as incomplete and compare only Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām, the number shared between them is ten out of seventeen. Of course, if we take into consideration the particular expeditions to which the names are assigned, the agreement diminishes substantially. This clearly raises questions about the reliability of the data, but for the moment let us take the pool as is.

3. Contextualizing the data

3.1 Tribal affiliation

There are a number of things we might like to know about the men named as deputies, but one of the most accessible is their tribal affiliation. This is something that clearly mattered intensely to the society in which they lived, and the information has been well preserved for posterity.

Here then are the eighteen members of the pool arranged according to their tribal affiliations. An annotation of the form “T11.23” indicates where the person appears in a standard set of genealogical tables.¹¹⁹ As a reminder of how well or poorly attested these men are as deputies, I assign to each a grade: [I] means that only one of our authors mentions him, [II] that two of them do, and [III] that all three do so.¹²⁰

119. Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab*, vol. 1. In “T11.23”, 11 is the number of the table and 23 the line number within the table.

120. This grading takes no account of the number of times each author mentions the deputy in question,

A. Qurashīs

Four out of the eighteen are Qurashīs, that is to say members of the Meccan tribe of Quraysh to which Muḥammad himself belonged. For each of them I give a clan affiliation within Quraysh in parentheses:¹²¹

Abū Salama, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-Asad (Makhzūmī, T22.22)	[II]
Ibn Umm Maktūm, ʿAmr ibn Qays ¹²² (ʿĀmirī, ¹²³ T28.23)	[III]
Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn (Jumaḥī, cf. T24.22) ¹²⁴	[I]
ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān (Umawī, T11.23)	[II]

B. Anṣārīs

Seven of the eighteen are Anṣārīs, that is to say members of the Medinese tribes of Aws and Khazraj who provided Muḥammad's hosts in Medina. Again I indicate clan affiliation in parentheses. Three of them are Awsīs:

Abū Lubāba, Bashīr ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhīr (ʿAmrī, ¹²⁵ T178.30)	[III]
Muḥammad ibn Maslama (Ḥārithī, ¹²⁶ T180.29)	[III]
Saʿd ibn Muʿādh (Ashhalī, T179.30)	[I]

It is no accident that the clans to which Muḥammad ibn Maslama and Saʿd ibn Muʿādh belonged are part of a wider sub-group of Aws known as the Nabīṭ. Unlike most Awsī clans this sub-group lived in lower Medina (the Sāfila as opposed to the ʿĀliya) along with the Khazrajī clans, and were not doing well in the years before Muḥammad's arrival; like the Khazrajī clans, they were early converts to Islam.¹²⁷

or whether he is named only as an alternative.

121. Distinguishing between tribes, clans within them, and wider tribal groupings that include them is a convenient Western practice; it does not correspond to any consistent usage of the Arabic sources. For this see Landau-Tasseron, "Alliances among the Arabs", 142–4 (using the term "section" rather than "clan").

122. For the question of his and his father's names see below, text to notes 148f.

123. He also bears the nisba al-Maʿīṣī, Maʿīṣ being a sub-clan of ʿĀmir (see T27–28).

124. The table shows Sāʾib ibn Mazʿūn and his brother ʿUthmān. So in principle Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn could be either a son of ʿUthmān not recorded here or a doublet of Sāʾib ibn Mazʿūn. The first seems more plausible (cf. below, note 162). Either way, it is clear that we have the right lineage: Ibn Ishāq names several more ancestors for Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn or his father (SS 1-2:258.5 = SG 116, SS 327.14 = SG 147, SS 367.9 = SG 168, SS 684.18 = SG 329), and they are identical with those of Sāʾib ibn Mazʿūn and his brother ʿUthmān as shown in T24.

125. That is to say of ʿAmr ibn ʿAwf ibn Mālik ibn al-Aws (see T177.22).

126. Wāqidī gives him the *nisba* al-Ashhalī (W 8.11), referring to the closely related clan of the Banū ʿAbd al-Ashhal (see T179) of which he is said to have been an ally (*ḥalīf*, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1377.6 no. 2344).

127. I am indebted to Michael Lecker for pointing this out to me; see *EP*, art. "al-Aws" (Y. Perlman), especially 12.

The other four are Khazrajīs:

‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn Ubayy (of Sālim al-Ḥublā, T189.29)	[I]
‘Abdallāh ibn Rawāḥa (Ḥārithī, T188.28)	[I]
Abū Dujāna, Simāk ibn Aws (Sā‘idī, T187.29)	[I]
Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubāda (Sā‘idī, T187.29)	[II]

C. Members of other tribes

Seven of the eighteen are members of tribes other than Quraysh, Aws, and Khazraj. With one exception they stem from Ḥijāzī desert tribes that in turn are considered to be parts of the wider tribal grouping of Kināna, to which Quraysh themselves belonged.¹²⁸ Three of them are Ghifārīs, the Banū Ghifār being a small tribe living between Mecca and Medina with a reputation as robbers:¹²⁹

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, Jundab ibn Junāda (T42.18)	[II]
Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī, Kulthūm ibn Ḥuṣayn (T42.19)	[III]
Sibā‘ ibn ‘Urfuṭa al-Ghifārī ¹³⁰	[III]

Two of them belong to the clan of Kalb, part of the tribe of Layth ibn Bakr, which again is considered as part of Kināna (and to be distinguished from the large and well-known tribe of Kalb, that is to say, Kalb ibn Wabara):¹³¹

Ghālib ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī (T37.19)	[I]
Numayla ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Laythī (T37.22)	[II]

One belongs to Du‘il ibn Bakr (this is the same Bakr as in the case of Layth ibn Bakr):¹³²

‘Uwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Du‘alī (T43.17) ¹³³	[II]
---	------

The last of the seven was born into the tribe of Kalb—Kalb ibn Wabara—which lived far to

128. For the genealogical relationships of these tribes to each other, see T3, T36, and T42.

129. *EP*, art. “Ghifār” (J. W. Fück); and see T42, showing them as part of Ḍamra. Caskel describes the tribe as poor (*Ġamharat an-nasab*, 2:266a). Note, however, that Ibn Ḥazm refers to them as a large clan (*baṭn ḍakhm*, *Jamhara*, 186.1), and that Muḥammad’s troops at the Faṭḥ are described as including 300 or 400 Ghifārīs (SS 3-4:421.9 = SG 557; W 819.9; but the context is one in which exaggeration could easily be suspected). They had a quarter (*maḥalla*) in Medina known as Sā‘ila (Ibn Shabba, *Ta’rīkh al-Madīna*, 1:261.7). For their reputation as robbers of the pilgrims (*surrāq al-ḥajīj*), see for example Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 5-6:20 no. 48 (*manāqib* 7). This and other traditions in the chapter invoke the Prophet to defend Ghifār; thus in no. 49 he includes Ghifār among a set of tribes that are better in the eyes of God, or on the day of the resurrection, than the major tribes of Arabia. The context of these traditions makes it clear that the audience might find such a claim surprising.

130. He does not appear in T42, nor in Ibn Ḥazm’s *Jamhara*.

131. See T36.

132. Again see T36. For the vocalization of the name of the tribal ancestor (Du‘il or Dīl), and of the *nisba* (Du‘alī), I follow Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab*, 2:234a.

133. The table gives the *ism* of al-Aḍbaṭ as Rabī‘a.

the north in the Syrian desert:¹³⁴

Zayd ibn Ḥāritha (T291.33)

[II]

3.2 Biographical profiles

Tribal affiliation apart, what sort of people were these men, at least as they appear in our sources? What qualities did they possess that might have been advantageous—or disadvantageous—for their performance of the role of deputy? I will attempt to lay the foundations for an answer to these questions by assembling a biographical profile for each member of our pool of deputies. I will take them in the order I used for their tribal affiliations, so again we start with the Qurashīs.

Abū Salama, ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abd al-Asad (Makhzūmī, T22.22) [II]

Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām agree in naming Abū Salama as deputy for one expedition (no. 4).¹³⁵ We have good reason to see him as someone Muḥammad could trust. He was an early convert—it is said the eleventh—with close links to Muḥammad: he had a Hāshimī mother, he was a milk-brother of Muḥammad, and on his deathbed he asked Muḥammad to marry his widow Umm Salama.¹³⁶ His career was cut off early—his death in 4/625 was a result of a wound sustained at the Battle of Uḥūd in 3/625.¹³⁷ Nevertheless we are told that Muḥammad appointed him commander of 150 men whom he sent out on an expedition to Qaṭan in 4/625.¹³⁸ He belonged to the powerful Meccan clan of Makhzūm, so there was nothing wrong with his social standing; and the fact of his marriage to Umm Salama tends to confirm this—her father Abū Umayya ibn al-Mughīra, likewise a Makhzūmī, was famously generous among Quraysh,¹³⁹ so he must have been wealthy, and she herself was reputed to have been the first woman to make her *hijra* to Medina in a litter.¹⁴⁰ Nevertheless, Abū Salama did not belong to the leading branch of the clan, which was strongly opposed to Muḥammad, and he had few fellow-clansmen with him in Medina.¹⁴¹ He had two sons,¹⁴² but apparently no further descendants.¹⁴³

134. See T279, and, for their location, *EP*², art. “Kalb b. Wabara”, section on the pre-Islamic period (J. W. Fück).

135. For his biography see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 939f no. 1589, 1682 no. 3013.

136. See Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 939.18, 939.17, 940.1, 940.7 respectively.

137. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1682.10 (but the year has to be 4, not 3 as stated).

138. W 3.17, 341.5, 341.9; SS 3-4:612.2 = SG 661f.

139. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1920.15 no. 4111 (*aḥad ajwād Quraysh al-mashhūrīn bi’l-karam*).

140. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1921.2 no. 4111, 1939.9 no. 4160 (*awwal za‘īna dakhlat al-Madīna muhājirat^{an}*).

141. *EP*², art. “Makhzūm” (M. Hinds), especially 138a.

142. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:1:170.21.

143. T22 shows none, and Ibn Ḥazm mentions none (*Jamhara*, 169.7).

Ibn Umm Maktūm, ‘Amr ibn Qays (‘Āmirī, T28.23) [III]

As we have seen, our three authors agree that Ibn Umm Maktūm served as deputy many times—far more than anyone else; though Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām are in frequent agreement regarding the expeditions for which he served, Khalīfa is not.¹⁴⁴ He was no doubt someone Muḥammad could trust. He was an early convert,¹⁴⁵ his mother was a maternal aunt of Khadija, Muḥammad’s first wife, and on one account he made his *hijra* to Medina ahead of Muḥammad, or perhaps it was a little after the Battle of Badr.¹⁴⁶ On the other hand, despite his Koranic fame—to which we will come shortly—much is obscure about him.¹⁴⁷ His name is disputed: was it ‘Abdallāh or ‘Amr?¹⁴⁸ So too is the name of his father—was it Qays, Zā’ida, or Shurayḥ?¹⁴⁹ Instead, he is known as the son of his mother Umm Maktūm,¹⁵⁰ an indignity in a patrilineal society.¹⁵¹ He is said to have been present at the Battle of Qādisiyya (c. 15/636), holding the standard, or at least a banner¹⁵²—a task for which he claimed to be uniquely well-qualified: as he used to say, “Give me the standard, I’m blind, I can’t run away, put me between the two ranks (*aqīmūnī bayn al-ṣaffayn*)!”¹⁵³ Indeed his blindness colors much of what we are told of his life. He was dependent on his dog, as he explained to Muḥammad when the order went out to kill the dogs of Medina;¹⁵⁴ this would suggest that he was too poor to purchase a slave. But his main claim to fame among posterity was his identification as the “blind man” of the opening of Sūrat ‘Abasa: “He frowned and turned away that the blind man came to him” (*‘abasa wa-tawallā an jā’ahu ʾl-a‘mā*, Q80:1–2). The story was that Muḥammad, at this time still in Mecca, was approached by Ibn Umm Maktūm and brushed him off because he was busy talking to a polytheist grandee; God responded by upbraiding His Prophet for this behavior, and Muḥammad then changed his tune. That the blind man was Ibn Umm Maktūm is affirmed, for example, by all the traditions quoted by Ṭabarī that name him.¹⁵⁵ Nor is this the only

144. See above, text to note 115. For the biography of Ibn Umm Maktūm see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 997f no. 1669, 1198f no. 1946, from which the information that follows is taken unless otherwise stated.

145. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 997.9 (*kāna qadīm al-Islām bi-Makka*).

146. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 997.10, 1198.13, 1198.15.

147. His obscurity is stressed by Caetani (*Annali*, 2:1:524).

148. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1198.11.

149. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 997.7, 997.17.

150. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1198.8.

151. The well-known Baṣran traditionist Ismā‘īl ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Miqṣam (d. 193/809), commonly known as Ibn ‘Ulayya after his mother, disliked being so-called, and is said to have considered himself slandered thereby (Ibn Ḥanbal, *ʿIlal*, 2:372 no. 2653, and the editor’s footnote thereto).

152. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1199.1, and cf. 998.4; Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:155.26, 156.5; Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 12:444 nos. 36,323f.

153. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:154.19.

154. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.5. The dog was given only a temporary reprieve.

155. Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 12:443f nos. 36,318–26, with the exception of no. 36,323, which does not relate to the incident. Muḥammad’s preferred interlocutor is described in no. 36,318 as one of the most powerful of the polytheists (*min ‘uzamā’ al-mushrikīn*), in no. 36,322 as a leading Qurashī (*rajul min ‘ilyat Quraysh*), in no. 36,325 as a wealthy Qurashī polytheist (*kathīr al-māl, ghanī*), and in no. 36,326 as a noble (*hādhā ʾl-sharīf*). See

Koranic verse that bears the imprint of Ibn Umm Maktūm's disability. We are told that Q4:95 originally came down in the form: "Such believers as sit at home are not the equals of those who struggle in the path of God."¹⁵⁶ Thereupon Ibn Umm Maktūm complained about the unfairness of this for someone like himself, and in response the phrase "unless they have an injury" (*ghayru ulī ʿl-ḍarar*) was promptly sent down and inserted after "Such believers as sit at home".¹⁵⁷ He is nevertheless said to have been present at the Battle of Qādisiyya, as we have seen, and even to have been killed there.¹⁵⁸ Alternatively, he returned to Medina after the battle and died, nothing further being heard of him after the reign of the Caliph ʿUmar (ruled 13–23/634–44)¹⁵⁹—which might suggest that his contemporaries were not paying attention to him in his last years. He does not appear to have had descendants.¹⁶⁰

Sāʿib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn (Jumaḥī, T24.22) [1]

Ibn Hishām has him as a deputy for one early expedition (no. 2). His biography is rather threadbare—Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr gives him only six lines.¹⁶¹ He tells us that he was one of the early Muslims who took refuge in Ethiopia, along with his father and two uncles,¹⁶² that he was present at Badr and other unspecified engagements, and that he was killed at the Battle of Yamāma (12/633) while still only in his thirties.¹⁶³ So he would have been in his twenties at the time when he served as deputy.¹⁶⁴ There seems to be a dearth of information about what he did between the Battles of Uḥud and Yamāma.¹⁶⁵ The

also Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.8, 153.15. As one of my audience in Philadelphia pointed out to me, Shīʿite scholars are unhappy with the notion that it was Muḥammad who frowned and turned away, and deny it outright; but they too identify the blind man as Ibn Umm Maktūm (Qummī, *Tafsīr*, 2:298.4; Ṭūsī, *Tibyān*, 10:268.7, 268.15; Ṭabrisī, *Majmaʿ al-bayān*, 5:437.15). Their concern is, of course, the apparent imputation of sin to the Prophet.

156. See for example Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:155.6, 155.17.

157. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:154.13, and the six traditions that follow there; Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 4:230–2 nos. 10,238–45, 10,247f, 10,250–5 (again there is no naming of a rival candidate for the role). Ṭabarī explains *ḍarar* as referring to loss of sight and other afflictions that stand in the way of participation in holy war (229.17).

158. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1199.2.

159. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1199.3; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:156.5.

160. T28 shows none, and Ibn Ḥazm mentions none (*Jamhara*, 171.13).

161. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 575 no. 896.

162. This makes him a son of ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn unrecorded at T24.23. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr also has a brief entry on Sāʿib ibn Mazʿūn, who likewise took refuge in Ethiopia and was present at Badr; he remarks that he does not know when he died (*Istīʿāb*, 575 no. 899). Muḥab al-Zubayrī states that the entire family of Mazʿūn were emigrants (*hājara āl Mazʿūn kulluhum, rijāluhum wa-nisāʾuhum, Nasab Quraysh*, 394.7; I owe my references to this source to Ella Landau Tasseron).

163. This information about his death is also found in Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 213.13.

164. Balādhurī tells us that he was born when his father was thirty, and that his father died aged thirty-seven (*Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 213.14); that would make him a child at the time he was deputy.

165. Ibn Hishām does not mention him after Badr, nor Wāqidi after Uḥud.

meagerness of the attestation of his life may in part result from a lack of descendants.¹⁶⁶

We nevertheless hear more of his father ‘Uthmān ibn Maz‘ūn, though he died not long after Badr.¹⁶⁷ An early convert,¹⁶⁸ the message of his biography is how close he was to Muḥammad, a closeness that was fully displayed in the context of his death, after which Muḥammad would visit his tomb and refer to him as a “righteous predecessor” (*al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ*).¹⁶⁹ Whether he was a person of consequence is less clear, but Ibn Hishām tells us that he was in charge of the first ten Muslims to take refuge in Ethiopia.¹⁷⁰ Despite his early death, he would still have been alive at the time when his son Sā’ib served as deputy. He did not have descendants other than his two sons.¹⁷¹

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān (*Umayy*, T11.23) [II]

Both Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām name him as a deputy for a couple of expeditions (nos. 9 and 15). He was an early convert, and successively the husband of two of Muḥammad’s daughters. He was also a member of the powerful sub-clan of Umayya within the clan of ‘Abd Shams, and a wealthy merchant, the first socially prestigious convert to the new religion. Moreover, unlike the other Qurashī deputies, he had with him in Medina a reasonable number of men associated with his clan.¹⁷² But he was not prominent in the time of Muḥammad or his first two successors.¹⁷³ One modern scholar has referred to his “glaring lack of military prowess”;¹⁷⁴ he never commanded an expedition. He was, of course, to become the third Caliph (ruled 23–35/644–56), but that could have been precisely because he was “the most unassuming and least important” of the major players at the time, who “wanted a log for their king”;¹⁷⁵ in contemplating him as a possible

166. See below, note 171.

167. He rates an entry in *EI*², art. “‘Uthmān b. Maz‘ūn” (A. J. Wensinck); and see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1053-6 no. 1779.

168. It is said the fourteenth convert to Islam (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1053.8).

169. For Muḥammad’s visits to his tomb, see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1054.2, and for the phrase *al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ*, see 1053.20. Muḥammad likewise speaks of him as *salafunā ‘l-ṣāliḥ* (Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 212.14, 212.18, 213.2).

170. SS 1-2:323.6 = SG 146 and 721 n. 190.

171. Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, 394.9; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 161.16; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 575 no. 899; and cf. T24.

172. Ibn Ishāq provides us with a list of Qurashīs deemed present on the Muslim side at the Battle of Badr, organizing it by clans. If we can take this as any indication of the relative demographic strength of the various Qurashī clans in Medina, then at sixteen those associated with ‘Abd Shams were the largest such group, though most of them were allies or freedmen rather than full members of the clan; the clans to which Abū Salama, Ibn Umm Maktūm, and Sā’ib ibn ‘Uthmān belonged had only five men each, though the proportion of full members was much higher (SS 1-2:677–85 = SG 327–30). The figures given by Wāqidī are close (W 153–7). These figures may, of course, be tendentious; for an anecdote illustrating the politics of the data regarding ‘Abd Shams, see Landau-Tasseron, “Status of allies”, 22.

173. For all this see *EI*², art. “‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān” (G. Levi della Vida and R. G. Khoury), especially 946.

174. Madelung, *Succession to Muḥammad*, 79.

175. Wellhausen, *Arab kingdom*, 40. This explanation is rejected by Madelung, but not because he takes

successor, his predecessor is said to have described him as a mild man (*rajul fihī līn*).¹⁷⁶ He had numerous descendants.¹⁷⁷

This completes our survey of the Qurashī deputies; we now move on to the Anṣārīs, starting with the Awsīs.

Abū Lubāba, Bashīr ibn ‘Abd al-Mundhir (‘Amrī, T178.30) [III]

All three of our authors agree that on the way to Badr Muḥammad sent him back to take charge of Medina, and Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām agree that he was also deputy for the next two expeditions. He was commonly known by his tecnonym (*kunya*) as “Abū Lubāba”, and there was doubt about whether his name was Bashīr or Rifā‘a,¹⁷⁸ or whether these were in fact two brothers.¹⁷⁹ He must have been a person of some authority if at the second ‘Aqaba meeting prior to the *hijra* he was in fact chosen to be one of the twelve leaders (*naqībs*) who were “to take charge of their people’s affairs” (*li-yakūnū ‘alā qawmihim bi-mā fihim*); even if it was rather his brother who was appointed, that could still tell us something about his social standing.¹⁸⁰ When the Banū Qurayza, who were allies of Aws, were under siege and considering surrender to Muḥammad, they had him send Abū Lubāba to them so that they could consult him; this again suggests that he was a person of some significance. The consultation led to a dramatic incident: Abū Lubāba let it slip to the Banū Qurayza that they would be executed, whereupon he was so stricken by conscience for having betrayed God and His Prophet that he bound himself to a pillar in the Prophet’s mosque, and went on hunger strike until such time as God forgave him.¹⁸¹ He may also have been wealthy, since he helped the nefarious builders of the Masjid al-Ḍirār with timber (*khashab*) which he took back after the demolition (*hadm*) of the mosque;¹⁸² that there was enough of it for him to build himself a house with it may be significant, given that timber was a scarce

a different view of ‘Uthmān’s character; he remarks that prior to his election to the Caliphate he had not displayed any “qualities of public leadership” (*Succession to Muḥammad*, 80).

176. Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, I/2779.6 = *History*, 14:146 (“a gentle person”).

177. See T11, and Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 83.6 (where the enumeration of ‘Uthmān’s descendants occupies the best part of four pages, and includes some in Spain, 85.20).

178. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 173 no. 195, and 1740.4 no. 3149.

179. They appear as such at T178; so also Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 334.2, and Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 241.2.

180. See SS 1-2:443.4 = SG 204 for the role of the *naqībs*, and 444.17 = 204 for the inclusion of Rifā‘a ibn ‘Abd al-Mundhir (his *kunya* is not mentioned) among the three Awsī *naqībs*. This is from Ibn Ishāq; Ibn Hishām then tells us that the scholars do not in fact include him (445.2 = 727 n. 241). Balādhurī does not include either brother as a *naqīb* (see *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 252.8), though Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr clearly believes Abū Lubāba to have been one (*Istī‘āb*, 500.14 no. 778, 1740.8).

181. SS 3-4:236.10 = SG 462f; W 505.20. For his refusal to eat or drink, see W 507.17. Another view was that his offense was hanging back from the Tabūk expedition (on the disagreement see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1741.3).

182. W 1047.5. For a translation of the passage and a commentary see Lecker, *Muslims, Jews and pagans*, 117f. Abū Lubāba also appears in a poor light in a story about a legal dispute with an orphan (W 281.12, 505.3).

resource in the Arabian wilderness. This too can be reckoned a brush with notoriety. At the Faḥḥ he carried the banner of his clan.¹⁸³ He died in the reign of ʿAlī (ruled 35–40/656–61),¹⁸⁴ we are told that he had descendants.¹⁸⁵

Muḥammad ibn Maslama (Ḥārithī, T180.29) [III]

All three of our authors name him as a deputy, Khalīfa for one expedition (no. 8), Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām for another (no. 26—but alongside alternatives).¹⁸⁶ An early convert in Medina,¹⁸⁷ he was close enough to Muḥammad to be a member of the small group that killed Kaʿb ibn al-Ashraf in 3/624, and in one account its leader.¹⁸⁸ In 3/625, at the time of the Battle of Uḥud, Muḥammad put him in charge of a guard (*ḥaras*) of fifty men patrolling around the camp (*ʿaskar*).¹⁸⁹ In 6/627 he commanded thirty men in an expedition against the Quraṭāʾ,¹⁹⁰ followed by one to Dhū ʿl-Qaṣṣa leading ten men;¹⁹¹ in 7/629, at the time of the ʿUmrāt al-Qaḍiyya, he was put in charge of a hundred horsemen.¹⁹² The report mentioned by Wāqidi that he was deputy for Tabūk stresses that this was the only one of Muḥammad’s campaigns that he missed.¹⁹³ Though not a major player in public affairs, he would seem to have prospered: he had ten sons and six daughters, borne to him by five wives and two concubines;¹⁹⁴ and whether or not he started rich, by the time of the Tabūk expedition in 9/630, he was sufficiently well-off to be among those who bankrolled

183. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1740.14; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:29.20; and cf. W 800.8, 896.3.

184. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1740.16.

185. None appear in T178, but see Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:29.23 (*lahu ʿaqib al-yawm*). Ibn Ḥazm notes a great-grandson of his who was killed at the Battle of Qudayd in 130/747 (*Jamhara*, 334.3; for this battle see Khalīfa, *Taʾrīkh*, 413.15). See also Ibn Qudāma, *Istibṣār*, 278.12, 331.7.

186. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1377 no. 2344. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr gives him a little less than a page.

187. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:19.3.

188. For divergent accounts of his role, see Lecker, “Wāqidi’s account”, 25f.

189. W 217.2; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 315.17. For other such commands see W 504.5, SS 3-4:238.13 = SG 463 (where he is in command of the *ḥaras al-Nabī* at the time of the attack on the Banū Qurayṣa) and W 602.7 (where he is one of three men who take turns commanding the guard on the Ḥudaybiya expedition).

190. W 4.13, 534.7; SS 3-4:612.4 = SG 662. For the Quraṭāʾ see T95 and Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab*, 2:472a.

191. W 4.17, 551.5, 551.17. Ibn Ishāq assigns this raid to Abū ʿUbayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ (SS 3-4:609.12 = SG 660).

192. W 733.9.

193. W 995.15; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:19.6. An uncharitable suspicion might be that the claim that he was deputy is an attempt to gloss over his absence from this campaign—absenteeism being a prominent theme in accounts of the Tabūk expedition. Note that the same claim appears in a boastful account of his campaigning transmitted from Muḥammad ibn Maslama by his great-great-grandson Ibrāhīm ibn Jaʿfar (Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:19.15; for his genealogy see Lecker, “Wāqidi’s account”, 17, and for Ibrāhīm’s role in transmitting a similarly tendentious report about his ancestor, 26). This Ibrāhīm can no doubt take some credit for the fact that Muḥammad ibn Maslama appears many times more often in the index to Wāqidi’s work than he does in that of Ibn Hishām’s.

194. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:18.20. Ibn Ḥazm notes a descendant of his, a traditionist living near Toledo (*Jamhara*, 341.17; for the location see 99.14 and n. 3).

the campaign.¹⁹⁵ At his death in 46/666 or so, it was Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, the governor of Medina, who prayed over him.¹⁹⁶ Was he already prominent before Muḥammad came to Medina, or did he owe his success to his close relationship with him? The report that after he came to Medina Muḥammad paired him with Abū ʿUbayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ in the “brothering” (*muʿākhāt*) at least suggests that he cannot have been a nobody.¹⁹⁷ Yet there is something about the services he renders Muḥammad that portrays him as an individual the Prophet could rely on to be useful, rather than as a player with a constituency of his own. Thus he served Muḥammad well in winding up the affairs of each of the three Jewish tribes.¹⁹⁸ This is particularly telling in the case of the Banū Qurayza: they were allies of the tribe of Aws,¹⁹⁹ and unlike Muḥammad ibn Maslama, the tribe at large interceded with Muḥammad on their behalf.²⁰⁰ Likewise when ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb urged Muḥammad to order the killing of the leading Hypocrite—the Khazrajī ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy—ʿUmar told Muḥammad to have Muḥammad ibn Maslama do the deed.²⁰¹ It might be going too far to describe him as someone who would do a patron’s dirty work, but there is at least a hint of this in the sources; thus he was still being useful to ʿUmar when the latter was Caliph, helping him out with “sensitive matters” (*umūr muḥdila*) in the provinces.²⁰² His progeny have already been noted.²⁰³

Saʿd ibn Muʿādh (Ashhālī, T179.30)[I]

Only Wāqidī names him as a deputy, and only for one expedition (no. 2). Apart from ʿUthmān, he is easily the most prominent figure we have yet considered.²⁰⁴ He was chief of his clan and, by the time of his death in 5/627, as we will soon see, of his tribe. He was an early convert in Medina,²⁰⁵ and a strong supporter of Muḥammad till he died from a wound sustained at the Battle of the Khandaq; Muḥammad had him nursed in a tent set up in the mosque, and would visit him daily while he lay dying.²⁰⁶ Four incidents show his political standing. The first was that when he converted, his entire clan converted with him, men and women.²⁰⁷ The second took place on the way to Badr, when Muḥammad held

195. W 991.10.

196. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1377.7; I adopt the death-date given by Ibn Saʿd (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:20.17).

197. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:19.5; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 224.2, 271.9.

198. See W 178.16 (Banū Qaynuqāʿ), 366.18, 374.8, 377.8 (Banū ʿl-Naḍīr), 509.16 (Banū Qurayza).

199. *EP*³, art. “al-Aws” (Y. Perlman), 12.

200. W 510.10 (where the narrator is Muḥammad ibn Maslama); SS 3-4:239.5 = SG 463.

201. W 418.18, 420.18. In Ibn Ishāq’s version ʿUmar names ʿAbbād ibn Bishr (SS 3-4:291.7 = SG 491), like Muḥammad ibn Maslama an Awsī (T179).

202. Madelung, *Succession to Muḥammad*, 112 n. 163.

203. Though they do not appear in T180.

204. He has an entry in *EP*², art. “Saʿd b. Muʿādh” (W. M. Watt).

205. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 602.15 no. 958.

206. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 603.4.

207. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:2.14.

a consultation with his followers. The question was whether the Anṣār would fight for him, something they had no obligation to do since the fighting was not defensive; it was Saʿd ibn Muʿādh who responded on behalf of the Anṣār, assuring Muḥammad of their support.²⁰⁸ The third incident took place in the context of the Battle of the Khandaq. Muhammad was considering buying off a part of the enemy coalition with a third of the date-harvest of Medina (*thulth thimār al-Madīna*), but before going ahead he needed to have the Anṣār on board—it was their harvest, not his. So he talked to the Awsī Saʿd ibn Muʿādh and the Khazrajī Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda; but Saʿd ibn Muʿādh—and presumably also Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda—were unwilling to entertain the idea.²⁰⁹ The two Saʿds thus represented their respective tribes, and Saʿd ibn Muʿādh on this occasion spoke for both of them. The final incident took place a few months later, when Saʿd ibn Muʿādh was dying. In the face of the demand of the Awsīs that their Jewish allies the Banū Qurayza should be spared, Muḥammad reached an agreement with them that one of their number should give judgment. He then selected Saʿd ibn Muʿādh, who proceeded to put his loyalty to Muḥammad ahead of the loyalties of his tribe, pronouncing that the men of the Banū Qurayza should be killed and their women and children enslaved.²¹⁰ Despite the outcome, which was not what Saʿd’s fellow-tribesmen would have liked to see, the appointment presupposed that he could validly speak for them. Indeed Muḥammad underlined Saʿd’s standing with them by giving the instruction “Stand for your chief!” when Saʿd arrived to give judgment.²¹¹ He had descendants.²¹²

Continuing with the Anṣārīs, we come now to the Khazrajīs.

ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy (of *Sālim al-Ḥublā*, T189.29) [I]

Ibn Hishām names him as deputy for one expedition (no. 14).²¹³ The clan to which he belonged was a respected one among the Anṣār.²¹⁴ His father ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy was notoriously both a powerful tribal chief and the leading Hypocrite of Medina till his death in 9/631.²¹⁵ The son was as good a Muslim as the father was a bad one, and was killed at the Battle of Yamāma in 12/633.²¹⁶ The question for us is whether at the time of the expedition

208. W 48.14; SS 1-2:615.8 = SG 294. In Wāqidi’s narrative Saʿd says “I’ll answer on behalf of the Anṣār”.

209. SS 3-4:223.5 = SG 454. In Wāqidi’s version the two Saʿds speak jointly (W 478.10), as they do on another occasion when they speak for the Anṣār with regard to the spoils of the Banū ʿl-Naḍir (W 379.10).

210. W 510.14, 512.11; SS 3-4:239.8 = SG 463f.

211. W 511.16; SS 3-4:239.22 = SG 463. In Ibn Ishāq’s version the Muhājirūn took this to be addressed to the Anṣār, while the Anṣār took it to be addressed to everyone. For the problems this instruction posed for later Muslim scholars see Kister, “Massacre of the Banū Qurayza”, 91f.

212. T179 shows none, but see Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 339.5, 339.7, and Ibn Qudāma, *Istibṣār*, 212.1.

213. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 940–2 no. 1590; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:89–91. Neither tells us much about ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh himself.

214. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 940.13 (*li-Banī ʿl-Ḥublā sharaf fi ʿl-Anṣār*).

215. For ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy see *El*², art. “ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy” (W. M. Watt); Lecker, “King Ibn Ubayy and the *quṣṣāṣ*”, especially 36–57. For the date of his death see W 1057.6.

216. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 942.2.

for which Ibn Hishām has him as deputy—in 4/626—he would have gained more from his father's high social and political standing than he lost through his tense relationship with him, and we have no way to answer it. One anecdote about him could nonetheless be read as evidence of a marked political astuteness, if we can set any store by it. This was at the time when 'Umar was urging Muḥammad to have 'Abdallāh ibn Ubayy killed. Apparently unaware that Muḥammad had rejected 'Umar's imprudent proposal, the son went to Muḥammad and offered to do the deed himself, pointing out that if anyone else did it, he feared that as the most dutiful son in all of Khazraj he would lose control of himself and kill the killer, thereby slaying a believer for an unbeliever and going to hell.²¹⁷ Naturally God's Prophet would hardly order a man to kill his own father in cold blood, and the son had thus politely served notice on Muḥammad that if anyone else undertook the killing he would retaliate. He had descendants.²¹⁸

'Abdallāh ibn Rawāḥa (Ḥārithī, T188.28) [I]

Wāqidī names him as deputy for one expedition (again no. 14).²¹⁹ An early convert to Islam in Medina, and a zealous enemy of the idols of his clan,²²⁰ he was one of the twelve *naqībs*.²²¹ He also had considerable poetic talent, and retained it after his conversion. When he used it in Mecca at the time of the 'Umrat al-qaḍā' to proclaim the triumph of Muḥammad over the polytheists, 'Umar asked him how he could recite poetry in the sanctuary of God and in the presence of His prophet; but Muḥammad responded that Ibn Rawāḥa's verse caused more grief to the polytheists than a hail of arrows.²²² He was the commander of a minor expedition in 6/628,²²³ and Muḥammad used him in other roles that make it clear he was someone he could trust, notably with regard to the administration of the produce of the oasis of Khaybar after its conquest.²²⁴ A certain manly cunning is displayed in an anecdote about how he once tricked his wife.²²⁵ But despite the fact that he was one of the *naqībs*, we do not get a sense of someone with a constituency. It may not be altogether fanciful to remember him as Jābir ibn 'Abdallāh did at the end of the expedition to Muraysī', ill-advisedly setting out alone on the road to Medina in the middle of the

217. W 420.18; SS 3-4:292.24 = SG 492.

218. T189 shows none, and Ibn Ḥazm mentions none (*Jamhara*, 355.1), but Ibn Sa'd lists five sons and states that he had progeny (*lahu 'aqib*), see *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:90.22, 91.1.

219. For his biography see *EP*², art. "'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa" (A. Schaade); Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 898–901 no. 1530 (mainly about his poetry).

220. For anecdotes about his role in the desecration and destruction of idols, see Lecker, "Idol worship", 338, 339f.

221. SS 2-3:443.12 = SG 204.

222. Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 10:228.15. In the parallel in W 735.15 Muḥammad's exchange with 'Umar is laconic (see 736.6), while in SS 3-4:371.11 = SG 531 it is missing altogether.

223. W 5.10, 566.1; SS 3-4:618.8 = SG 665. According to Wāqidī thirty men went on this expedition (W 567.2).

224. See Lecker, "Idol worship", 339.

225. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 900.16.

night.²²⁶ He was killed at the Battle of Muṭa in 8/629,²²⁷ and is said to have had descendants in Spain.²²⁸

Abū Dujāna, Simāk ibn Aws (Sāʿidī, T187.29) [I]

Ibn Hishām names him as deputy for one expedition, the last (no. 27), though with an alternative.²²⁹ Like ʿAbdallāh ibn Rawāḥa (and Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda) he was involved at an early stage in breaking up the idols of his clan.²³⁰ It is disputed whether his father’s name was Aws or Kharasha. In the “brothering” soon after Muḥammad came to Medina, he was paired with ʿUtba ibn Ghazwān—an early Meccan convert (he claimed to be the seventh), but not a Qurashī.²³¹ He showed great prowess as a fighter on the battlefield, and is described as “the bravest Anṣārī of his day”,²³² as just one example, he played a prominent part in defending Muḥammad in the thick of the Battle of Uḥud.²³³ He does not, however, appear as a leader, on the battlefield or elsewhere—though Muḥammad assigned him the standard of Khazraj in the Tabūk expedition.²³⁴ The paucity of his record of leadership correlates with the fact that he was poor: he was one of two men who alone among the Anṣār were given a share of the spoils of the Banū ʿl-Naḍīr, the reason being that they were both needy (*muḥtājayn*).²³⁵ He died at the Battle of Yamāma in 12/633—though another account has it that he survived to participate in the Battle of Ṣiffīn (37/657).²³⁶ Ibn Saʿd notes a son and states that in his own day there were descendants of Abū Dujāna in Medina and Baghdad.²³⁷

Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda (Sāʿidī, T187.29) [II]

Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām agree in naming him as deputy for the first expedition led by

226. W 439.14.

227. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 898.5.

228. Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 363.14; contrast Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:79.18 (*laysa lahu ʿaqib*).

229. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 651f no. 1060, 1644 no. 2938. As Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr remarks, he is known by his tecnonym (651.18).

230. Lecker, “Idol worship”, 341; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:143.4.

231. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1644.14. For ʿUtba’s biography see 1026–9 no. 1764. He was an ally (*ḥalīf*) of the Qurashī clan of Nawfal (1026.13).

232. Ibn Durayd, *Ishtiqāq*, 456.8 (*ashjaʿ Anṣārī fi dahrihi*). Most of Balādhuri’s references to him are in connection with men he killed on the battlefield (*Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamid Allāh, 149.6, 298.2, 299.20, 300.15, 301.1, 301.4, 334.14, 335.10, 335.12); most of Wāqidi’s references to him are likewise in connection with his valorous deeds.

233. W 240.20, 246.9; SS 3-4:82.11 = SG 381.

234. W 996.6.

235. W 379.13; SS 3-4:192.7 = SG 438; and see Lecker, *Muslims, Jews and pagans*, 123. According to Ibn Ishāq the two pled poverty (*dhakarā faqrān*).

236. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 652.4.

237. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:101.15, 102.13. By contrast, T187 shows no descendants, and Ibn Ḥazm mentions none (*Jamhara*, 366.6).

Muḥammad (no. 1). The sources present him as the Khazrajī counterpart of the Awsī Saʿd ibn Muʿādh: the chief of his clan, and, in due course, of his tribe.²³⁸ He converted earlier than his counterpart, played a part in breaking the idols of his clan,²³⁹ and was one of the twelve *naqībs*.²⁴⁰ He also outlived him. We have already seen how he and Saʿd ibn Muʿādh appear together representing their respective tribes; in one of these contexts Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) remarks that “they were the chiefs of their two tribes (*sayyiday qawmihimā*), Saʿd ibn Muʿādh was the chief of Aws and Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda of Khazraj”.²⁴¹ What made him very different from Saʿd ibn Muʿādh was his continuing identification with the interests of his tribal constituency; this was strong enough to damage his reputation with posterity.²⁴² At the Faḥḥ his wish to deal harshly with Quraysh put him at odds with Muḥammad, who reacted by making him hand over the standard to one of his sons.²⁴³ When the resentment of the Anṣār at the skewed distribution of the spoils of Hawāzin boiled over, and Muḥammad asked Saʿd where he stood on the matter, he replied, “I can only stand with my people” (*mā anā illā min qawmī*).²⁴⁴ And in the succession crisis following Muḥammad’s death, though ill at the time, he was a contender for power; typically, the support he had from within his own tribe was partial, while Aws rejected him.²⁴⁵ “I will never give allegiance to a Qurashī!” (*lā ubāyīʿu Qurashiyyan abadān*), as he is later said to have told an emissary of ʿUmar’s.²⁴⁶ His authority as a tribal chief was reinforced by the fact that he was independently wealthy: his family had an ongoing tradition of inviting all comers to free meals, and would give ten sacrificial animals to the goddess Manāt, later to the Kaʿba.²⁴⁷ He died in Syria within a few years of Muḥammad, in rather obscure circumstances sometimes said to involve the *jinn*.²⁴⁸ He had descendants: two of his six sons had progeny in Spain.²⁴⁹

This completes the Anṣārī deputies, and we come now to members of tribes other than Quraysh, Aws, and Khazraj. We begin with the three Ghifārīs. The Banū Ghifār, as

238. For his biography see *EP*, art. “Saʿd b. ʿUbāda” (W. M. Watt); Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 594–9 no. 944. Ibn Qudāma refers to him as “chief of all Khazraj” (*sayyid al-Khazraj kullihā, Istibṣār*, 93.5).

239. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:143.4.

240. SS 1-2:444.9 = SG 204.

241. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 596.18. Likewise Mubarrad (d. 286/900) describes them as *sayyidā ʿl-ḥayyayn al-Aws waʿl-Khazraj (Kāmil*, 1249.1).

242. In addition to those that follow, for another incident of this kind see W 431.7; SS 3-4:300.17 = SG 496 (in the context of the Ifk).

243. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 597.9, 598.15. For another version see SS 3-4:406.12 = SG 549.

244. SS 3-4:499.2 = 596. Or perhaps rather “I’m just one of my people”; Wāqidi has it as *mā anā illā ka-aḥadīhim* (W 957.8).

245. Lecker, “King Ibn Ubayy and the *quṣṣās*”, 29 n. 2; *EP*, art. “Bashīr b. Saʿd” (M. Lecker).

246. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamid Allāh, 589.14.

247. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 595.6, 595.11, 595.17. They were *muṭʿimūn*.

248. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 599.5.

249. For his six sons (by two wives) see Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:142.13. For the two with descendants in Spain, see Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 365.17; only these two appear in T187. See also Ibn Qudāma, *Istibṣār*, 97.7, 99.3, 99.6.

already noted, were a small tribe living between Mecca and Medina, and like Quraysh were considered a part of the wider grouping of Kināna.

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, Jundab ibn Junāda (T42.18) [II]

Wāqidī names him as a deputy for one expedition (no. 23), Ibn Hishām for two (nos. 15 and 17), in each case with an alternative. Abū Dharr was well-known for his uncompromising piety.²⁵⁰ After hearing about Muḥammad, he came to Mecca to check him out, and became a very early convert to Islam, it is said the fourth or fifth; he then returned to his tribe.²⁵¹ But before he did so a characteristic episode took place. Muḥammad advised him not to let the Meccans know that he had converted, whereupon Abū Dharr promptly betook himself to the sanctuary—the social centre of Meccan society—and declaimed the Muslim confession of faith at the top of his voice. For this he was duly beaten up and had to be rescued by Muḥammad’s uncle ‘Abbās, who cleverly pointed out that the Ghifārīs bestrode the trade route between Mecca and Syria. The next day Abū Dharr repeated his performance, and had to be rescued again.²⁵² But despite his early conversion, he did not join Muḥammad in Medina until after the Battle of the Khandaq.²⁵³ Even then his role in Muḥammad’s expeditions does not seem to have been particularly prominent.²⁵⁴ Later he went to Syria, where he got into trouble with the governor, Mu‘āwiya ibn Abī Sufyān, over a loaded exegetical question: when God promised punishment for “those who treasure up gold and silver, and do not expend them in the way of God” (Q9:34), was He talking about the People of the Book, as Mu‘āwiya maintained, or about Muslims too, as Abū Dharr insisted?²⁵⁵ Mu‘āwiya complained to the Caliph ‘Uthmān that Abū Dharr’s presence in Syria was subversive,²⁵⁶ and as a result of this commotion the Caliph exiled him to Rabadha, where he died in 32/653 or so.²⁵⁷ Rabadha was located three days’ journey from Medina, and is described by Abū Dharr’s wife Umm Dharr—and by the Prophet—as a desert (*falāt min al-arḍ*).²⁵⁸ In this appropriate setting, ‘Abdallāh

250. For his biography see *EF*², art. “Abū Dharr” (J. Robson); Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 252–6 no. 339, 1652–6 no. 2944; Cameron, *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, which collects much material on him (for his role as deputy, see 28–31, 44, not without errors). There is a wide range of views about his name and that of his father (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 252.2, 1652.10).

251. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 252.11, 1653.1.

252. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 1654.10.

253. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 252.13. This makes it unlikely that Muḥammad can have paired him with al-Mundhir ibn ‘Amr al-Sā‘idī—one of the twelve *naqībs*—in the “brothering” that he instituted soon after arriving in Medina (see 1450.3 no. 2494 for this disputed question).

254. At one point he is listed among twenty horsemen (W 571.8), and twice he carries the standard of the Banū Ghifār (see 819.9 for the Fath, and 896.10 for the Battle of Ḥunayn).

255. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:166.15 (the first half of the verse is about rabbis and monks, so that Mu‘āwiya’s interpretation, however politically tendentious, is entirely plausible). For this conflict between Abū Dharr and Mu‘āwiya see Cameron, *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, 62–119.

256. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:166.26 (*inna Abā Dharr qad afsada ‘l-nās bi‘l-Shām*).

257. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 253.1; Cameron, *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, 120–5.

258. See Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam al-buldān*, 3:24b.16, art. “al-Rabadha”; for the phrase *falāt min al-arḍ*, see Ibn

ibn Masʿūd, who prayed over him (and himself died later in the same year), summed up the character of Abū Dharr with the words: “He lived alone, he died alone, and he’ll be resurrected alone.”²⁵⁹ The ultimate loner, nothing we are told about him suggests an ability to work with others, or to handle trouble as opposed to making it through his inflexibility. Muḥammad is said to have refused a request from Abū Dharr to be given a position of authority (*imāra*), telling him he was “weak” (*daʿīf*).²⁶⁰ That he is mentioned among the Ahl al-Ṣuffa suggests that he may have been poor;²⁶¹ but he may not have remained so, since he is reported to have acquired a court (*dār*) containing several houses (*buyūt*).²⁶² He seems to have had no descendants.²⁶³

Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī, Kulthūm ibn Ḥuṣayn (T42.19) [III]

All three of our authors name him as a deputy for one or more of the later expeditions (nos. 23, 24, and 25), though there is not much agreement as to which expedition or expeditions it was.²⁶⁴ One of these was a particularly long absence: during the Faḥ (no. 25) and the campaigns that followed it, Muḥammad was away from Medina for some two-and-a-half months.²⁶⁵ Abū Ruhm is known by his tecnonym, but his name is not in dispute, though there is disagreement about his father’s name.²⁶⁶ He lived in Medina—though he also had a place to stay (*manzil*) in or near the territory of his tribe²⁶⁷—and he converted after Muḥammad’s arrival. He clearly had standing with his tribe. During the preparations for the Faḥ, Muḥammad sent emissaries to mobilize the various tribes on whose support he was counting; one of his two emissaries to Ghifār was Abū Ruhm.²⁶⁸ Muḥammad did the

ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 253.17, 254.4. For a very different view of Rabadha in early Islamic times as “a thriving place, and not the contemporary equivalent of Siberia”, see *El*², art. “al-Rabadha” (S. ʿA. ʿA. al-Rashid), citing archaeological evidence.

259. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 253.10. In other accounts the remark goes back to Muḥammad (W 1000.14, 1001.5; SS 3-4:524.6, 524.16 = SG 606).

260. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:170.14, and cf. 170.10.

261. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 1:2:14.9; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 272.10; *El*², art. “Ahl al-ṣuffa” (W. M. Watt).

262. Ibn Shabba, *Taʾrīkh al-Madīna*, 1:253.17.

263. T42 shows none, and Ibn Ḥazm states that he had none (*Jamhara*, 186.9). But see Cameron, *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, 33 for some descendants in modern Iran.

264. Note also the expeditions assigned to Abū Ruhm by Ibn Ḥabīb and Balādhurī (see above, text to notes 78–81, 83).

265. Muḥammad left Medina on 10 Ramaḍān (SS 3-4:399.22 = SG 545; W 801.7) and did not return until near the end of Dhū ʿl-Qaʿda, or even in the following month (SS 3-4:500.16 = SG 597, 782 n. 853; W 960.2, 973.11).

266. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1327 no. 2209 and 1659f no. 2960. The second of these two entries records the alternative names of his father.

267. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1327.8, 1660.4.

268. W 799.16. The text seems corrupt: *ilā Banī ʿl-Ḥuṣayn* is no doubt to be deleted, and the addition of Ḍamra to Ghifār does not make sense since Ḍamra is a larger tribal grouping that includes Ghifār (see T42 and Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 465.20).

same thing for the Tabūk campaign, and again he sent Abū Ruhm to his tribe;²⁶⁹ this was an unpopular expedition, and Muḥammad later questioned Abū Ruhm about Ghifārīs who had stayed behind.²⁷⁰ But Abū Ruhm's usefulness was not confined to dealings with his own tribe. After the Battle of Ḥunayn, the defeated tribe of Hawāzin asked Muḥammad for the return of their captive women and children, and to be able to grant this petition he needed the agreement of his troops. Thus at one point he sent emissaries to three constituencies to secure their consent: the Anṣār, the Muhājirūn, and the Arab tribes (*qabā'il al-ʿArab*). The emissary to the Arab tribes was Abū Ruhm.²⁷¹ Significantly, we hear of no such commissions being entrusted to Abū Dharr. But equally significantly, we would not expect an outsider like Abū Ruhm to have standing among the core tribes of Muḥammad's community, and there is nothing to suggest that he had it. Like Abū Dharr, Abū Ruhm is not said to have had descendants.²⁷² The date of his death is not recorded.

Sibā' ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī [III]

All three authors name him as a deputy for one or more of five expeditions (nos. 8, 16, 23, 26, and 27), in a couple of cases with an alternative.²⁷³ Though he is not known to the genealogists, we can take it that he was a Ghifārī because the sources regularly refer to him as one.²⁷⁴ And these two things—his role as deputy and his tribal affiliation—are in fact almost all that our sources have to tell us about him.²⁷⁵ Thus the references made to him by Wāqidī, Ibn Hishām, Khalīfa, Balādhurī, and Ṭabarī relate exclusively to his role as deputy, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr in his entry on him can add to this only that he was one of the older Companions of Muḥammad (*min kibār al-Ṣaḥāba*).²⁷⁶ We do not know the date of his death or whether he had descendants.

We now come to two deputies belonging to the clan of Kalb, which as already mentioned is part of the tribe of Layth ibn Bakr, which again is a part of Kināna.²⁷⁷ The two look like they could be brothers, but are not.

269. W 990.15.

270. W 1001.18; SS 3-4:529.1 = SG 609; and cf. SS 518.21 = SG 603.

271. W 952.9.

272. None appear in T42 or are mentioned in Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 186.17.

273. Of these deputyships one—for the Khaybar expedition (no. 23)—is unusually widely attested because it is central to a well-known tradition about Abū Hurayra's arrival in Medina; I will return to it below, text to notes 320, 329.

274. See, for example, W 8.9; SS 3-4:43.14 = SG 751 n. 563. The *nisba* Balādhurī gives him is al-Kinānī (*Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 341.13, 352.11), Kināna being the wider grouping to which Ghifār belongs.

275. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 682 no. 1129; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. ʿUmar, 5:108.3 no. 753 (both entries of less than two lines). He is said to have acquired a building-plot (*khiṭṭa*) at the Muṣallā, which is not where the Ghifārīs at large settled in Medina (Ibn Shabba, *Taʾrīkh al-Madīna*, 1:261.5).

276. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 682 no. 1129.

277. This clan is often referred to as “Kalb Layth” to distinguish it from the much larger tribe of Kalb (see, for example, SS 3-4:622.18 = SG 667).

Ghālib ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī (T37.19) [I]

Only Khalīfa mentions him as a deputy, and without specifying for which expedition or expeditions he was appointed; in other words, this is the vaguest reference to a deputy in our corpus of evidence.²⁷⁸ What Ghālib was remembered for was his role as the commander of three expeditions sent out by Muḥammad: one against the Banū Murra in 7/628f, one to Mayfaʿa in 7/629, and one to Kadīd in 8/629.²⁷⁹ He reappears as a military commander during the early conquests outside Arabia.²⁸⁰ A vivid narrative of his expedition against the Banū Murra depicts a man with a talent for military leadership—someone with impressive presence who makes tactical decisions quickly and decisively.²⁸¹ Virtually the only other thing we are told about him is that Muḥammad sent him ahead to clear the path for him (*li-yusahhila lahu l-ṭarīq*) at the time of the Faṭḥ.²⁸² No descendants are recorded.²⁸³

Numayla ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī (T37.22) [II]

Wāqidī does not name him as a deputy, but Ibn Hishām does so for three expeditions (nos. 17, 22, and 23), and Khalīfa for one (no. 17). Numayla and Ghālib appear to be three generations apart, which is odd.²⁸⁴ Numayla is a little-known figure.²⁸⁵ More precisely, apart from his genealogy and his role as deputy, there are only two things we are told about him. One is that he was among a few dozen people to whom Muḥammad gave allowances (*ṭuʿam*) from the produce of a part of Khaybar after its conquest in 7/628.²⁸⁶ The other is that at the Faṭḥ he killed a drunken cousin of his father, Miqyas ibn Ṣubāba;²⁸⁷ this Miqyas was one of the people Muḥammad had explicitly excepted from the general amnesty he

278. But for a possible identification, see above, note 71. For Ghālib's biography, see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1252 no. 2057. There is some disagreement about his father's name.

279. For the expedition against the Banū Murra, see W 723.18; SS 3-4:622.18 = SG 667; Khalīfa, *Taʾrīkh*, 40.9. For the expedition to Mayfaʿa, see W 5.17, 726.9 (Ibn Hishām has no account of this expedition, see Jones, "Chronology of the *maghāzī*", 254 n. 20). For the expedition to Kadīd, see W 6.3, 750.14; SS 3-4:609.20 = SG 660. Some sources mention a much earlier raid led by Ghālib on Sulaym and Ghaṭafān in 2/624 (Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, I/1364.1 = *History*, 7:89; Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 117.3). Ibn Saʿd's entry on him speaks only of the raids he led (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. ʿUmar, 5:122.1 no. 780).

280. Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, I/2188.6, 2196.7, 2233.13 = *History*, 11:201, 209, 12:27. In the first two of these references the troops he commands are described as belonging to Kināna; no such statements are made about the men he commands in the time of Muḥammad, and none of the individuals mentioned by name in the accounts of the relevant expeditions given by Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām are Kinānis.

281. W 724.4; see also 727.1 on the Mayfaʿa expedition.

282. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1252.14; and see Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, 4:1:99.2 no. 437.

283. See T37; Ibn Ḥazm does not mention him in his *Jamhara*.

284. See T37, where their last common ancestor is seven generations before Numayla and four before Ghālib.

285. For his biography see the brief entries in Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1533f no. 2664; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. ʿUmar, 5:126.11 no. 784. Balādhurī gives him the *nisba* al-Kinānī (*Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 352.12).

286. W 695.4 (I take the document to end at 695.6); SS 3-4:352.7 = SG 522.

287. His father's name appears variously as Ṣubāba, Ḍubāba, and Ḥubāba.

extended to the Meccans.²⁸⁸ As a result Numayla was criticized locally for having disgraced his kinsfolk.²⁸⁹ He would seem to have lived into the time of the first civil war,²⁹⁰ we do not know of any descendants.²⁹¹

We have one more deputy from the local tribes of the Ḥijāz, this time a member of Duʿil ibn Bakr, yet another part of Kināna.

ʿUwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Duʿalī (T43.17) [II]

Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa agree that he was deputy for an expedition, but disagree as to which it was (no. 22 or no. 24). He is perhaps the least-known of all our deputies.²⁹² Neither Wāqidi nor Ṭabarī mentions him; nor do Ibn Hishām or Khalīfa, except to name him once as a deputy. Unlike our other deputies, he is said to have converted only in the year of the expedition to Ḥudaybiya, that is in 6/628; if so, it would seem unlikely that he would have served as deputy for that expedition (no. 22). According to a somewhat cryptic report, during the expedition to Ḥudaybiya the tribe of Khuzāʿa urged Muḥammad to attack the most powerful family of Tihāma (*aʿazz bayt bi-Tihāma*); he responded that the women of ʿUwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ should not be scared, for he was urging his people to adopt Islam (*kāna yaʿmuruhum biʾl-Islām*).²⁹³ If this indicates the standing of the family of ʿUwayf in Tihāma, it is curiously inconsistent with his general obscurity. We do not know the date of his death or whether he had descendants.²⁹⁴

As already mentioned, the last of our deputies was born into the far-away tribe of Kalb ibn Wabara.

Zayd ibn Ḥāritha (T291.33) [II]

Zayd is named as a deputy by both Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām for one expedition (no. 3) and by Wāqidi alone for another (no. 17). In our pool of deputies he stands out as an

288. W 408.10, 860.16, 875.5; SS 3-4:410.19 = SG 551. The story goes back to an incident of friendly fire during the expedition to Muraysīʿ (see W 407.20, 861.7; SS 3-4:290.11, 293.14 = SG 490, 492). For the general amnesty see W 825.7; SS 3-4:409.8 = SG 550.

289. See W 861.4; SS 3-4:410.20 = SG 551, where the verses are attributed to a sister of Miqyas.

290. He reports a letter sent by Umm Salama to the people of Iraq urging unity (Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 2708 no. 6471).

291. None are shown in T37, and Ibn Ḥazm does not indicate any (*Jamhara*, 182.1).

292. For his biography see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb*, 1247f no. 2051 (a five-line entry); Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. ʿUmar, 5:133.1 no. 792. For his name there is a variant form ʿUwayth; his father’s name may also be given as Rabīʿa, with al-Aḍbaṭ (“ambidextrous”) as his nickname. Balādhurī, in a practice of his that is by now familiar, gives him the *nisba* al-Kinānī (*Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 353.12).

293. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. ʿUmar, 5:133.3; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. ʿAẓm, 10:36.10; Ibn Mākūlā, *Ikmāl*, 1:15.14, 6:174.5, and the editor’s footnotes to the second passage.

294. T43 shows none; he is not in Ibn Ḥazm’s *Jamhara*.

exceptional case in more than one respect.²⁹⁵ First, he was not by origin a local—he did not belong to any of the tribes of Kināna or to either tribe of the Anṣār. Second, he had been a slave: though born a free member of the northern tribe of Kalb, he had had the misfortune to be sold into slavery. His presence in Mecca arose from this enslavement; that he was later manumitted could not wipe out the social and political stigma that arose from it according to the norms of Arabian society. Third, he happened to be the slave, freedman, and for a while adopted son of Muḥammad himself.²⁹⁶ He was thus closely bonded to Muḥammad,²⁹⁷ but had no agnatic ties to the wider community of his followers. The resulting tensions were manifested both socially and politically. Socially, he got to marry four Qurashī women,²⁹⁸ but anecdotal evidence suggests that two of them disliked the prospect so much that they gave way only in the face of overwhelming pressure from God and His prophet. One objected that she was Zayd's social superior (*anā khayr minhu ḥasab^{an}*), the other angrily complained—with her brother—that Muḥammad had married her to his slave (*zawwajanā 'abdahu*).²⁹⁹ Politically, Zayd commanded a quite unusually large number of expeditions. Ibn Ishāq's data put the number at six, whereas no other person commanded more than two expeditions, and most commanded only one; Wāqidī's data put the number at eight, whereas no other person commanded more than three expeditions, and most again commanded only one.³⁰⁰ He would no doubt have commanded yet more expeditions had he not been killed at the Battle of Mu'ta in 8/629. But again, this prominence was not well received: according to remarks ascribed to Muḥammad close to the time of his own death, these appointments were resented.³⁰¹ Zayd had descendants.³⁰²

295. For his biography see *EP*, art. "Zayd ibn Ḥāritha" (M. Lecker); Powers, *Zayd*. He also stands out in being the only Companion named in the Koran (Q33:37), but this need not concern us.

296. Adoption would seem to have been an uncommon practice in pre-Islamic Arabia, and one that did not put the adopted son on the same footing as a real son (see Landau-Tasseron, "Adoption", 171f).

297. As a member of Muḥammad's household he was naturally an early convert, though just how early was disputed (see Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 546.1, and Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's own comment thereto).

298. For his marriages see *EP*, art. "Zayd ibn Ḥāritha", 475b; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 469.4, 471.7.

299. See Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 10:301f no. 28,516 for Zaynab bint Jaḥsh, and no. 28,517 for Umm Kulthūm bint 'Uqba ibn Abī Mu'ayṭ. These traditions appear overwhelmingly in *tafsīr* to Q33:36 (but for an exception, though very likely of exegetical origin, see W 1126.19). The second is quoted in Arazi, "Les enfants adultérins", 9, together with a parallel to the first in which the Zaynab indignantly asks Muḥammad "You marry your niece to your freedman (*mawlā*)?" See further Powers, *Zayd*, 32f and 129 n. 19. The other two Qurashī women whom Zayd married were Durra bint Abī Lahab and Hind bint al-'Awwām; I have not seen such anecdotes about them.

300. Powers gives the number of expeditions commanded by Zayd as nine (*Zayd*, 106; but cf. below, note 366). I will return to the role of Zayd as a commander below, text to notes 366f.

301. W 1119.3; SS 3-4:650.10 = SG 679; Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:2:41.13 (and see 3:1:32.2); Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Ma'rifaṭ al-Ṣaḥāba*, 1139 no. 2855 (from Mūsā ibn 'Uqba); Powers, *Zayd*, 76. The context is the grumbling against the last commander Muḥammad ever appointed, Usāma ibn Zayd; Muḥammad reminisces that there had likewise been discontent about his father's role as commander.

302. See T291; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara*, 459.5; also *EP*, art. "Zayd ibn Ḥāritha", 475b, and Powers, *Zayd*, 85f on his numerous grandchildren.

This completes our survey of the pool of deputies named in our three early sources. Above we noted in passing two additional persons named as deputies in relatively early sources: one was ‘Alī, named by Ibn Ḥabīb, Ya‘qūbī, and Mas‘ūdī for Tabūk (no. 26), and the other was Nājiya ibn Jundab al-Aslamī, named by Ibn Ḥibbān for the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ (no. 24).³⁰³ ‘Alī’s deputyship, unlike Nājiya’s, is mentioned by several later authors.³⁰⁴ I have also noted three further names found only in later authors: Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) mentions Jī‘āl ibn Surāqa al-Ḍamrī as deputy for Muraysī‘ (no. 17) and Bashīr ibn Sa‘d al-Anṣārī for the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ (no. 24), while Diyārbakrī (writing c. 940/1534) names one Ibn Abī Mikraz as deputy for Uḥud (no. 11).³⁰⁵ In the cases of Nājiya, Bashīr, and Ibn Abī Mikraz, there is at least some reason to suspect that these names represent errors of transmission rather than the survival of information deriving from early sources now lost to us. In any case, I do not include any of these five names in the pool.

We are now ready to proceed to a discussion of the data.

4. Discussion

4.1 What to believe

Our evidence regarding the deputies is of two kinds. First, there are the specific statements found in the sources about their appointment as deputies. Second, there is the wider range of biographical information we have assembled about them. Let us consider each in turn.

As we have seen, statements about the deputies Muḥammad appointed appear regularly in works of the late second and early third century, but not earlier. This, of course, is the best part of two centuries after the events that the sources describe. Frequently we are told nothing about how the information reached our sources; thus it is unusual for us to find it backed up with a chain of authorities (*isnād*), despite the fact that the use of such chains was already well-established in the scholarly culture of the day.³⁰⁶ This suggests that it was

303. For ‘Alī see above, text to notes 81, 86, 95; for Nājiya see above, note 98.

304. Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ṭabrisī, Mughulṭāy, Ibn Khaldūn, Diyārbakrī, and Ḥalabī (see the appendix). Of these seven, only Ṭabrisī is Shī‘ite.

305. See the appendix.

306. There are only four expeditions out of the twenty-seven for which we know or have reason to believe that Ibn Ishāq named the deputy: Badr (see above, note 49), Kudr (see above, note 67), the Faṭḥ (see above, note 63, and text to notes 20, 88), and Tabūk (see above, note 64 and text to note 89); only one of these, the third, comes with an *isnād* going back to a Companion of Muḥammad, namely ‘Abdallāh ibn al-‘Abbās. Apart from Ibn Ishāq, the first and last of these are also supported by other lines of transmission (for Badr see above, note 49, and for Tabūk see above, text to note 19, and note 64). In the case of Tabūk we also have the tradition about the appointment of ‘Alī going back to Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ (see above, note 81). In addition, we are told by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr that Zuhri named the deputy for the Khandaq (see below, the third paragraph of the appendix), and we have the widely-attested tradition from or about the Companion Abū Hurayra regarding the Khaybar expedition (see below, text to notes 320, 329). When we come to Wāqidi matters are less clear: it may not be obvious what is and is not covered by an *isnād*, and in any case his *isnāds* can be rather vague (*qālū*, “they said”, preceding statements about the appointment of deputies at W 277.8, 546.20, 683.15, 995.5). That leaves six *isnāds* for information about deputies that are worth attention (W 100.17, 180.15, 183.18, 197.3, 402.11, 537.17; they relate to Badr, to Badr, Qaynuqā‘, and Sawīq, to Kudr, to Buḥrān, to Dhāt al-Riqā‘, and to

only rather late that the idea emerged that no account of an expedition led by Muḥammad was complete without the identification of his deputy in Medina; Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām clearly thought this way, but two generations before them Ibn Ishāq only occasionally saw fit to mention a deputy.³⁰⁷ To this we can add an argument from silence. Some now lost biographical works on the life of Muḥammad by contemporaries of Ibn Ishāq survived for centuries. Thus the Spanish scholar Abū Bakr ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī (d. 575/1179) had access to those of Mūsā ibn ʿUqba (d. 141/758f) and Sulaymān ibn Ṭarkhān (d. 143/761), while Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449) still had access to that of Mūsā ibn ʿUqba.³⁰⁸ The medieval scholars quote these works quite frequently, yet I have only seen a single instance of a quotation from one of them making reference to a deputy.³⁰⁹ So there is real doubt as to how information dating from the time of Muḥammad reached our sources—if it did. A crucial question here is how far we have mutually independent sources that could corroborate each other's testimony. We tend to be suspicious if the sources agree too much or too little with each other—too much because it would suggest interdependence, too little because not enough is corroborated. In the present case the complaint can hardly be that the sources agree too much. While they do agree on the basic principle that when going out on an expedition Muḥammad would appoint a deputy, once we ask who the deputy was for any particular expedition, our three main sources are much more likely to disagree than to agree—though things look better if we confine ourselves to Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām.³¹⁰ And as we have seen, the extent of the overlap between the sources increases considerably if, rather than concern ourselves with particular expeditions, we are content to assemble a pool of people who at one time or another are said to have served as deputies; can we then take that overlap as corroboration? We can, of course, argue that it is not clear what motive people would have had for inventing information about who acted as deputies. But there is a ready answer to this: given the emergence of the principle that every expedition had to have its deputy, there would have been an obvious motive for the

Ghāba respectively). As usual, several of Wāqidī's informants are not covered by the biographical literature of the traditionists, but it is worth noting that all but the first and last of these six *isnāds* go back two links before Wāqidī, one of them to the Medinese ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ḥazm (d. 135/752f) (W180.15; for this traditionist see Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, 14:349–52 no. 3190). The first and sixth *isnāds* go back three links. The first stems from the Medinese ʿAbdallāh ibn Muknif al-Ḥārithī, whose *floruit* must have been around the early second/eighth century (on him see 16:176 no. 3591). The sixth goes back to the Companion Salama ibn al-Akwaʿ (d. 74/693f) (for whom see 11:301f no. 2462). In sum, putting together the data set out in this note, we find that there are attributions going back behind the generation of Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām for eleven of the twenty-seven expeditions, although only four of these attributions are supported by *isnāds* claiming to go back to Companions of Muḥammad.

307. For the four expeditions for which we have evidence that Ibn Ishāq named a deputy, see the preceding note.

308. See Abū Bakr ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī, *Fahrassa*, 230.11, 231.3, and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Muʿjam al-mufāhras*, 74 no. 189. For the arrival of both works in Spain, see Jarrar, *Prophetenbiographie*, 72, 81.

309. For Mūsā ibn ʿUqba on Abū Lubāba as deputy for Badr, see above, note 49. It is significant that the focus of the report is on who was deemed present at Badr, *not* on who was deputy (Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 403 no. 1203; the passage begins: *wa-shahida Badr^{an} (read so) min al-Anṣār min al-Aws...*).

310. See the tabulations in section 2.4 above.

scholars of the generation of Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām to plug any gaps. Yet why they should have plugged so many gaps with people of such little consequence is harder to explain in these terms. One strategy that considerations of this kind might suggest would be to see what sort of a picture emerges if we consider only our better-attested deputies—let us say those rated [III] in my listing above. That would limit us to a subpool of five: Ibn Umm Maktūm, Abū Lubāba, Muḥammad ibn Maslama, Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī, and Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī. But the main thing that emerges from all these thoughts is indeterminacy: we have no way to be sure whether, or to what extent, our lists of deputies do or do not have a real historical foundation.³¹¹

Similar doubts arise about the wider biographical material, though in a more diffuse way. What we can say on the basis of the sketches presented above is that the picture of any given deputy that emerges from our sources tends to possess a certain coherence. But how far that coherence is a historical or a literary phenomenon is a question we have again no sure way to answer. In addition, it is perhaps worth drawing attention here to two factors that could skew our sense of the prominence or otherwise of particular deputies in the lifetime of the Prophet. One is the date of a man's death: to die before the conquests was to miss out on a quite exceptional opportunity to amass wealth and power and thereby gain the attention of posterity.³¹² The other is whether he has descendants:³¹³ an energetic descendant can be an effective lobbyist promoting the reputation of an ancestor. Whether these factors operated across the board is hard to tell, but as we have seen they both find a striking illustration in the case of Muḥammad ibn Maslama.³¹⁴

We have, then, two options. We can give up on any attempt to use the material in our sources for the reconstruction of what actually happened, in which case this article ends here. Or we can ask what historical reconstruction is possible if we make the assumption that the sources do in fact convey to us a significant measure of truth. This assumption does not seem unreasonable, and the rest of the article will be based on it.³¹⁵

4.2 What we see

Near the beginning of this article I referred to the expectation that Muḥammad would tend to appoint deputies who satisfied three criteria: they would be men he could trust, they would be men with previous experience of the job, and they would be men with significant social and political clout. In contrast to tribal affiliation and previous experience

311. For skeptical comments on the historicity of the information on deputies found in our sources, see Cameron, *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, 30, 31.

312. The deputies known to have lived longest are, in ascending order of their death-dates, Abū Dharr, ʿUthmān, Abū Lubāba, and Muḥammad ibn Maslama.

313. The deputies known to have descendants are Abū Salama, ʿUthmān, all the Anṣārīs bar ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy, and Zayd ibn Ḥāritha. That none of the six Kinānīs are recorded to have had descendants could mean that they lived in less favored circumstances, or that our sources were less attentive to them.

314. For his progeny see above, note 193, and text to note 194.

315. To use the analogy of two of Patricia Crone's works, I take my cue from her *Slaves on horses* rather than her *Meccan trade and the rise of Islam*.

of the job, trust and clout are not things that can be established unambiguously with a quick reference to the sources; instead they require research that is more laborious and judgments that are more subjective. But the biographical profiles of the individual deputies that I provided above were intended in considerable measure to collect the relevant information insofar as it is available.

Trust need not detain us long. We cannot administer polygraph tests to Muḥammad's deputies, but if we go by such indications as early conversion, piety, zeal, personal closeness to Muḥammad, financial probity, or willingness to kill a kinsman because Muḥammad wanted him dead, then I would be inclined to divide the eighteen deputies into three categories. For twelve of them we have reason to believe that Muḥammad could trust them, and no reason to think otherwise. For two of them we have some reason to believe that he could trust them, but at the same time some ground for reservation—in the case of Abū Lubāba his lapse when he went to counsel the Banū Qurayṣa and his connection with the Masjīd al-Ḍirār, and in the case of Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda his excessive loyalty to his clan or tribe. That leaves four—none of them members of the core tribes—of whom the sources have nothing relevant to say. My categorization of some individuals is inevitably rather subjective, and things could have changed over the course of Muḥammad's time in Medina, but the overall conclusion is hard to avoid. It is also unremarkable—we would not have expected Muḥammad to appoint deputies he was unable to trust.³¹⁶

Previous experience in the job is easy to reckon. If we go by Wāqidi's data as tabulated above,³¹⁷ he names twelve men as having served as deputies, or having been alleged to have done so. Seven of them would have served once only, two of them twice, two of them thrice, and one of them thirteen times. If we go by Ibn Hishām's data as tabulated, he names fifteen men as having served or been alleged to serve. Nine of them would have served once only, two of them twice, two of them thrice, one of them possibly four times, and one of them ten times. In percentage terms, the proportion of deputies who serve only once is 58 percent for Wāqidi and 60 percent for Ibn Hishām. Thus in both cases the majority of those who served as deputy did so only once—which is not what we would have expected.

What then can we say about clout? Here it may be worth summarizing the data in a table. I use the following code:

YES = definitely has clout
yes = perhaps has clout
no = perhaps lacks clout
NO = definitely lacks clout

316. Perhaps we could imagine Muḥammad on some occasion appointing ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy as his deputy in analogy with Lyndon Johnson's celebrated remark about J. Edgar Hoover that it was "better to have him inside the tent pissing out, than outside the tent pissing in." But our sources do not suggest that Muḥammad ever picked a deputy in this way, though his generous treatment of his former Meccan enemies in the aftermath of the Faḥ perhaps meets the Johnson criterion (*ET*², art. "al-Muʿallafa qulūbuhum" (Ed.)).

317. For Wāqidi and Ibn Hishām's data see above, Sections 2.2 and 2.5. The outlier is in each case Ibn Umm Maktūm.

In parentheses I give a brief justification; for details, see the biographical profile for the deputy in question. Again my individual ratings are somewhat subjective, but the overall shape of the results is fairly robust.

QURASHĪS:

Abū Salama	no (few fellow-clansmen in Medina)
Ibn Umm Maktūm	NO (blind, insignificant, known after his mother, etc.)
Sāʾib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Mazʿūn	NO (little known, too young)
ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān	yes (unwarlike, but rich, future Caliph)

AWSĪS:

Abū Lubāba	YES (perhaps a <i>naqīb</i> , trusted by Qurayza, wealthy)
Muḥammad ibn Maslama	yes (competent commander, owed success to Prophet?)
Saʿd ibn Muʿādh	YES (strong clan and tribal chief)

KHAZRAJĪS:

ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy	yes (rather little-known, at odds with his father)
ʿAbdallāh ibn Rawāḥa	no (<i>naqīb</i> , but rather alone)
Abū Dujāna	NO (brave warrior but not a leader)
Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda	YES (powerful clan and tribal chief)

KINĀNĪS:

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī	NO (little clout in Medina, imprudent, inflexible, loner)
Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī	no (clout with his tribe but not much in Medina)
Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfuṭa al-Ghifārī	NO (little clout in Medina, virtually unknown)
Ghālīb ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī	no (fine commander but little clout in Medina)
Numayla ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Laythī	NO (no clout in Medina, virtually unknown)
ʿUwayf ibn al-Aḍbaṭ al-Duʿalī	NO (no clout in Medina, virtually unknown)

KALBĪ:

Zayd ibn Ḥāritha	NO (servile background, no constituency, resented)
------------------	--

TOTALS:

YES: 3
yes: 3
no: 4
NO: 8

Several points stand out here.

First, there is a set of three Anṣārī deputies who meet the clout criterion with flying colors, and are the only ones to do so. The two Saʿds are perfect, both of them clan chiefs who could readily mobilize their constituencies in the face of an emergency. At the same time Abū Lubāba clearly satisfies the criterion. Moreover, the fact that these three were

Anṣārīs made them particularly apt appointments. For one thing, being Medinese, they were better placed than the Muhājirūn to respond to local challenges; for another, when Muḥammad went out on campaign he was likely to take with him a higher proportion of the Muhājirūn than of the Anṣār. This is no doubt relevant to the fact that seven of the deputies are Anṣārīs but only four of them Qurashīs. But not quite half of the Anṣārī deputies fully meet the criterion. Muḥammad ibn Maslama, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy, and ʿAbdallāh ibn Rawāḥa are less convincing, and Abū Dujāna—a fine warrior but not a leader—is not convincing at all.

Second, of the four Qurashīs, the only one close to meeting the criterion is ʿUthmān. Abū Salama lacked fellow-clansmen and Sāʿib ibn ʿUthmān ibn Maẓʿūn was a little-known figure and too young. But the most egregious case is of course Ibn Umm Maktūm. In political terms he was a nobody, albeit one remarkably well-known to posterity thanks to the attention paid to him on two occasions by God. He was called after his mother rather than his father, he was poor, he was easily brushed off, and above all he was blind. Why then would Muḥammad appoint a blind man to watch his back when he went out on campaign? And yet the consensus is that Ibn Umm Maktūm was deputy for something like a dozen campaigns, far more than anyone else; and even if he only served twice, as a deviant tradition has it, that would still stand in need of explanation.

Third, we have a set of six Kinānīs—three Ghifārīs, two Laythīs, and one Duʿalī. Simply by virtue of their tribal affiliations they would have lacked significant constituencies in Medina. Moreover several of them are little known figures—notably Sibāʿ, Numayla, and ʿUwayf—and that fact alone makes it unlikely that they were people of consequence at the time.

So we have a puzzle. Our sources are telling us that Muḥammad was more likely than not to appoint as his deputy someone who lacked both experience of the job and the political and social clout needed to respond to an emergency in his absence.³¹⁸ If that really is what Muḥammad did, why would he do it? The rest of this discussion will be about ways in which we might solve this puzzle.

4.3 How do we explain it?

What is the role of the deputy?

A first question here would be whether we—or rather I—might have misunderstood the role of the deputy in the opening section of this paper. What do the sources actually tell us

318. This feature of the deputies was already noted by Caetani, who with some exaggeration stated that Muḥammad always appointed “persone di nessuna importanza ed influenza sociale” (*Annali*, 2:1:522; he later speaks more accurately of the obscurity of the names of the greater part (“della maggior parte”) of these persons, 524). For Caetani at this point in his work their obscurity was not a puzzle: these men were merely leaders of the communal prayer (522, 524). Yet earlier in the work he had clearly tended to think of them as exercising an administrative role: the terms he uses most often for the deputies he names in his accounts of the individual expeditions are “luogotenente” and “rappresentante”, and in the context of the Tabūk expedition he speaks of “il governo”, as well as leading the prayer, being left to the deputy (see, for example, 1:461, 533, 585, 707, and, for Tabūk, 2:1:245f). In these pages he only occasionally mentions the task of leading the prayer in addition to this role (2:1:118, 245f) or on its own (1:481, 568, 691).

that a deputy does? Here information is scarce because their attention is nearly always on Muḥammad and his expedition; they rarely tell us anything about what is happening back home in Medina while he is absent. But we may hope to glean things here and there.

We can at least start on solid ground. The role of the deputy that we hear most of is taking the place of Muḥammad in leading the communal prayer in the Prophet's mosque in Medina.³¹⁹ Thus when Abū Hurayra came to Medina with a group of fellow-tribesmen, Muḥammad was away on the expedition to Khaybar; they accordingly prayed the morning prayer behind Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa, who was deputy on this occasion.³²⁰ Likewise at one point in his account of the Battle of Uḥud, Wāqidi remarks of Ibn Umm Maktūm that Muḥammad had left him behind in Medina to conduct the prayer (*khallafahu bi'l-Madīna yuṣallī bi'l-nās*).³²¹ Ibn Sa'd tells us that Muḥammad appointed him to act as deputy over Medina, conducting the prayer, for most of his expeditions, and quotes a series of traditions to back this up.³²² The close link between serving as deputy and conducting the prayer is apparent in Sha'bi's response to the question whether a blind man may lead the prayer (*a-ya'ummu 'l-a'mā 'l-qawm?*); he replies only that the Prophet appointed Ibn Umm Maktūm as deputy (*istakhlafa*).³²³ Another tradition tells us that while serving as deputy for one expedition (no. 8), Ibn Umm Maktūm would conduct the Friday prayer (*kāna yujammi'u bihim*), and would deliver the sermon (*yakhṭubu*).³²⁴ This is just the kind of thing Ibn Umm Maktūm

319. The view that this was the *only* role of the deputy was, as we have seen, adopted by Caetani, for whom at this point “Maometto non ebbe mai luogotenenti o ministri”, *Annali*, 2:1:524 (contrast his use of the term “luogotenente” with reference to a deputy eleven times earlier in the work). His position is adopted by Cameron (*Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī*, 28–31).

320. W 636.15; similarly Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:54.18. This tradition is widely known; see, for example, Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 2:345.29; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-awsaṭ*, 1:91 no. 53; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-ṣaḡhīr*, 1:18.2; Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Ma'rīfat al-Ṣaḡhāba*, 1451f no. 3679; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 4:198.7; and for further references, see Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Arna'ūṭ, 14:226f no. 8552, n. 2. The common link for most of these traditions is a little-known Medinese Ghifārī, Khuthaym ibn 'Irāk ibn Mālik (for whom see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 8:228–30 no. 1679); he transmits the tradition from his father 'Irāk ibn Mālik, a better-known Medinese pietist who died sometime in the years 101–5/720–4, and again was of course a Ghifārī (for him see Mizzi, *Tahdhīb*, 19:545–9 no. 3893). In some versions Abū Hurayra himself tells the story, in others it is told about him. One version inserts “a group of Ghifārīs” (*nafar min Banī Ghifār*) between Abū Hurayra and 'Irāk (see Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 4:198.7, and cf. Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-awsaṭ*, 1:91.11, and Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:54.18). In other words, the message of this *isnād* is that the tradition is a reminiscence about Sibā' treasured by his Ghifārī fellow-tribesmen, and that for them the role of Abū Hurayra is incidental.

321. W 277.13; similarly Ibn Hishām (SS 3–4:64.1 = SG 752 no. 583).

322. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:150.26. In the traditions phrases like *yuṣallī bi'l-nās* alternate with *ya'ummu 'l-nās* (151.4, 151.7, 151.9, 151.15).

323. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.22. Conversely, one of the arguments in favour of the legitimacy of Abū Bakr's Caliphate was that he led the prayer during Muḥammad's final illness.

324. W 183.18; Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:153.25. He would stand beside the *minbar*, not on it.

was good at: he also taught people the Koran,³²⁵ and was one of Muḥammad's muezzins.³²⁶

But what if there was trouble? To my knowledge there is only one clear occasion when we get to see a deputy under severe stress. This, unsurprisingly, came at the time of the defeat of Muḥammad at Uḥud, when the remnants of his forces fled back to Medina with the false rumour that Muḥammad himself had been killed. Ibn Umm Maktūm, who was the deputy, expressed his vexation to those who had fled (*ja'ala yu'affifu bihim*), then walked out on the road to Uḥud till he encountered the returning forces and learnt from them that Muḥammad was alive.³²⁷ Here we get a strong sense of his personal concern, but not that he was asserting command and control in what could have been a disastrous situation. At the time of the expedition against the Banū Liḥyān (no. 20) we are told that the Anṣār were concerned that an enemy might attack Medina in their absence (*inna 'l-Madīna khāliya minnā wa-qad ba'udnā 'anhā, wa-lā na'manu 'aduwwan yukhālifunā ilayhā*); in response Muḥammad assured them that angels were guarding every gap in its perimeter, but made no mention of any role of the deputy (who was Ibn Umm Maktūm).³²⁸ What we do encounter on one occasion is a deputy who takes care of a tribal delegation that had come to Medina at the time when Muḥammad was away leading the expedition to Khaybar: after the morning prayer Abū Hurayra and his fellow-tribesmen approached the deputy, Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa, and he supplied them with some provisions (*fa-zawwadanā shay'an*) for their journey to see Muḥammad at Khaybar—or in a variant text, “he equipped us” (*jahhazanā*).³²⁹ This indicates that Sibā' was in charge, and suggests that Muḥammad had placed some public resources at his disposal. But there is no trace in our sources of the pairing of leading the prayer with military command so characteristic of later provincial government.

So did Muḥammad just not concern himself with the possibility that things might go wrong in Medina? Did he really leave things to the angels? Or did he make other arrangements, perhaps ones that our sources do not usually report? There are some faint indications that he might have done something of this kind, at least on occasion.

One such occasion is the Battle of Badr. Wāqidi tells us in four places that Muḥammad

325. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:151.25. We are told that when he arrived in Medina he settled in the Dār al-Qurrā', identified with the Dār Makhrama ibn Nawfal (Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:150.25). Presumably we should think of the Dār al-Qurrā' as located in the court *later* acquired by Makhrama ibn Nawfal (d. 54/673f); he converted only at the time of the Fath (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 1380.14 no. 2349), and so could not have been in possession of his court in Medina at the time of Ibn Umm Maktūm's arrival. Samhūdī, by contrast, identifies the Dār al-Qurrā' as belonging to 'Abdallāh ibn Mas'ūd (see Lecker, “*Wa-bi-Rādhān mā bi-Rādhān*”, 59, and Samhūdī, *Wafā' al-wafā*, 2:267.14, 295.8, 3:58.1).

326. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:152.3, and several further traditions on this page. There is no suggestion in the sources that his religious competence gave him a wider authority.

327. W 277.12. Compare also the case of Badr (below, text to note 335).

328. Ibn Ḥazm, *Jawāmi'*, 201.7; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Durar*, 197.12. Neither Wāqidi nor Ibn Hishām has this anecdote.

329. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:2:54.18 (in the biography of Abū Hurayra). The parallel passage in Wāqidi's work omits the reference to provisions (W 637.1), but it is found in, for example, Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 2:346.1, and Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 4:199.1. For the variant with *jahhazanā* see Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Ma'rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, 1452.4; the term *jahāz* could refer to military equipment (cf. below, text to note 358).

appointed Abū Lubāba as deputy over Medina at this time;³³⁰ there is nothing unusual here except that in one place he adds that Muḥammad sent him back from Rawḥā' (four days journey from Medina on the way to Badr), appointing him (*ista'malahu*) deputy over Medina.³³¹ Presumably he had had second thoughts about the home front. We likewise find in Ibn Hishām's work a passage in which, according to Ibn Ishāq, it is alleged that Abū Lubāba went out with Muḥammad, who then sent him back, appointing (*ammara*) him over Medina.³³² All this would imply that Muḥammad had not appointed a deputy as he was leaving Medina—unless indeed he successively appointed *two* deputies. That he did just that is stated by Ibn Hishām, who tells us that he first appointed (*ista'mala*) Ibn Umm Maktūm to conduct the prayer (*'alā 'l-ṣalāt bi'l-nās*), and then sent back Abū Lubāba from Rawḥā', appointing him over Medina (*ista'malahu 'alā 'l-Madīna*).³³³ Are we then to think of Abū Lubāba as *replacing* Ibn Umm Maktūm in the role of deputy, or as playing a distinct role *alongside* him? The only thing that is suggestive in these passages is the terminology. The term *ista'mala*, which Wāqidi does not normally use, might perhaps suggest something closer to the appointment of a governor, just as the exceptional use of the term *ammara* by Ibn Ishāq might point to something like the appointment of a commander (*amīr*).³³⁴ Do these word choices then hint at a differentiation of Abū Lubāba's role from Ibn Umm Maktūm's? On the other hand, at the point at which we see him in action, Abū Lubāba does not behave as if he had authority of such a kind. When the false rumour spread that Muḥammad had been defeated at Badr, one of the Hypocrites exulted in telling Abū Lubāba about this Muslim defeat; Abū Lubāba told him firmly that God would show his words to be false (*yukadhdhibu 'lāh qawlaka*),³³⁵ but we do not exactly see him taking charge of a volatile situation. Moreover, it seems that while he was at Rawḥā' on the way to Badr, Muḥammad had heard of some untoward development among one of the Awsī clans, the Banū 'Amr ibn Awf; but instead of leaving it to Abū Lubāba to take care of the matter as deputy, he sent back someone else to deal with it.³³⁶

The next occasion on which we hear anything of this kind is Ḥudaybiya. Here all three of our main authors name a single deputy, though in each case a different one. Balādhurī, however, starts by naming Ibn Umm Maktūm, adds that it is said that it was Abū Ruhm,

330. W 8.1, 101.9 (*khallafahu*), 159.11 (*ista'malahu*), 180.16 (*istakhlafahu*).

331. W 159.12; similarly Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:29.13 (*ista'malahu*). For the distance from Medina to Rawḥā', see 2:1:7.24.

332. SS 1-2:688.16 = SG 331.

333. SS 1-2:612.13 = SG 738 no. 354; similarly Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, 61.11. Maqrīzī tells us that Muḥammad appointed Ibn Umm Maktūm *'alā 'l-Madīna wa-'alā 'l-ṣalāt (Imtā' al-asmā'*, 1:83.2), implying that when he subsequently appointed Abū Lubāba (112.9), the latter can only have been a replacement.

334. Compare the statement of Ibn Sayyid al-Nās that Muḥammad sent Abū Lubāba back to Medina as governor (*wāliyan*, *Uyūn al-athar*, 1:297.2).

335. W 115.12.

336. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:6.25. Here Ibn Sa'd says that Muḥammad sent back Ḥārith ibn Ḥāṭib al-'Amrī to the Banū 'Amr ibn Awf "because of something he heard about them" (*li-shay' balaghahu 'anhum*). Both Abū Lubāba and Ḥārith belonged to the clan in question. For a discussion of this and related reports, see Lecker, *Muslims, Jews and pagans*, 138–40.

and ends by mentioning a third view: “Some say that he appointed *both* of them deputies (*istakhlafahumā jamī’an*), and that Ibn Umm Maktūm was in charge of prayer (‘*alā ḡl-ṣalāt*).”³³⁷ That would imply that Abū Ruḥm’s job description was something else.

We come now to the Faḥ and the ensuing events. Again, the point of interest is something Balādhurī tells us. He has already dealt with the Faḥ itself, stating that the deputy was Ibn Umm Maktūm, *or* it is said Abū Ruḥm.³³⁸ He then goes on to the Battle of Ḥunayn, and tells us that Muḥammad now confirmed Ibn Umm Maktūm *and* Abū Ruḥm over Medina.³³⁹ Then he turns to the expedition to Ṭāʿif, and informs us that the deputy was Ibn Umm Maktūm *or* Abū Ruḥm.³⁴⁰ The “and” in the second of the three passages, taken on its own, would support the idea of a dual appointment; but of course we cannot put any weight on the text at this point—from “or” to “and” (*aw* to *wa-*) is an easy corruption.

There is perhaps one more thing that should be added here. At the time of the expedition to Ghāba, Wāqidī quotes his sources as saying (*qālū*) that Muḥammad made Ibn Umm Maktūm deputy over Medina, and in the same breath adds that Saʿd ibn ʿUbāda stayed behind (*aqāma*) to guard Medina with three hundred men of his people for five nights, until Muḥammad returned.³⁴¹ But the language used here is not that employed to refer to the appointment of deputies.

In contrast to all this tantalizing ambiguity, there is one scholar who seeks to reconcile the sources by pursuing the idea of dual deputyships in a forthright manner. This is the Cairene author of the biography of Muḥammad commonly known as *al-Sira al-Ḥalabiyya*, ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1044/1635). Speaking of the Battle of Badr, he tells us that Muḥammad designated Abū Lubāba as governor of Medina (*wāliyan ʿalā ḡl-Madīna*), and that he appointed Ibn Umm Maktūm over prayer in Medina (‘*alā ḡl-ṣalāt biḡl-nās fī ḡl-Madīna*).³⁴² Speaking of the expedition to Kudr (no. 8), he notes that Sibāʿ ibn ʿUrfaḥa and Ibn Umm Maktūm are mentioned as alternative deputies on this occasion.³⁴³ He then goes on to argue that there need be no contradiction here, since the pair could have served concurrently in different capacities. Thus he reads a tradition in the collection of Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889) to mean that the appointment of Ibn Umm Maktūm was *only* over prayer in Medina, to the exclusion of the administration of justice (*al-qaḍāyā waḡl-aḥkām*), since a blind man cannot function as judge; so Muḥammad could have delegated

337. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 350.21.

338. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 364.13.

339. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 365.4.

340. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 366.23.

341. W 546.20. In the parallel passage in Ibn Saʿd we find *khallafa* in place of *aqāma*, with Muḥammad as the subject of the verb (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 2:1:58.10). We hear of such forces of guards in other contexts in the life of Muḥammad (see, for example, Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥamīd Allāh, 314.10); what is exceptional is the pairing of the commander of the guards with the deputy that we find in this instance.

342. Ḥalabī, *Insān al-ʿuyūn*, 2:381.3, 381.6.

343. Ḥalabī, *Insān al-ʿuyūn*, 2:470.18.

judicial authority to Sibā^c.³⁴⁴ Finally, speaking of the expedition to Ḥudaybiya, he echoes the third view noted by Balādhurī, that Muḥammad appointed both Ibn Umm Maktūm and Abū Ruhm, with Ibn Umm Maktūm over prayer; he then goes on to specify, as Balādhurī did not, that Abū Ruhm's role on this view would be as guardian of the security of Medina (*ḥāfiẓan lil-Madīna*).³⁴⁵ He does not say that this is how it was, but he clearly likes the idea. I present these remarks of Ḥalabī's because they are conceptually interesting, not because they are historically compelling. The only piece of evidence he cites is, as we have seen, a tradition from the collection of Abū Dāwūd. It is the sole tradition in the chapter on the blind man as a prayer-leader (*bāb imāmat al-a'mā*).³⁴⁶ This Baṣran tradition states that Muḥammad made Ibn Umm Maktūm his deputy (*istakhlafa*), leading the prayer despite being blind (*ya'ummu 'l-nās wa-huwa a'mā*). It is hard to read this tradition as saying anything one way or another about what further roles Ibn Umm Maktūm might or might not have assumed when serving as deputy.

In short, evidence for dual deputyships exists, but it is rather shadowy. If we took it seriously, it might help to explain why the sources so often disagree about who was deputy—they could be picking different members of the pair. But it would be putting a lot of strain on the evidence we have to imagine that Muḥammad made such an arrangement each time he left on an expedition. The fact is that we are usually very much in the dark about any arrangements Muḥammad may have made for Medina in his absence other than the appointment of a single deputy.

Are deputies the B team?

A very different point about deputies is that whoever Muḥammad appointed would not be with him on the expedition. In other words, leaving someone behind as deputy comes with an opportunity cost, and the greater the deputy's political and military skills, the greater the opportunity cost. As Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) explains, when rulers go out on campaign they take with them those from whose presence they stand to benefit most—those whose counsel, good judgment, eloquence, and martial force they depend on; in the absence of serious problems (*siyāsa kathīra*) in the capital, the person who stays behind does not need all this.³⁴⁷ From such a point of view it could be argued that there was a reason to appoint inferior men as deputies. Nothing was lost by not having Ibn Umm Maktūm on the battlefield, despite his brave assertion that blindness was a virtue in a standard-bearer; and this fact might help to explain why we find him serving as deputy

344. He later refers back to this solution, see Ḥalabī, *Insān al-ʿuyūn*, 2:480.15. So far as I know he is the only author to consider judicial authority in connection with the role of the deputy.

345. Ḥalabī, *Insān al-ʿuyūn*, 2:689.7.

346. Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, 1:162 no. 595 (*ṣalāt* 64).

347. Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna*, 4:88.13. Note, however, that in this passage he has in mind the Tabūk expedition, which he sees as exceptional in the absence of any threat to Medina at the time (89.3). Contrast the insistence of a well-known Imāmī scholar, the Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022), in his discussion of the same expedition that Muḥammad knew that only ʿAlī was competent to take his place in deterring the enemy, safeguarding Medina, and protecting its inhabitants (*irhāb al-ʿaduww wa-ḥirāsāt dār al-hijra wa-ḥiyāṭat man fihā*, *Irshād*, 155.12 = trans. Howard, 107).

for nearly half of Muḥammad's expeditions. The same was no doubt true of the unwarlike ʿUthmān. But a number of considerations should discourage us from pushing this line of thought very far.

First, some of those chosen by Muḥammad to be deputies were very effective on the battlefield, for example Abū Dujāna as a common soldier and Ghālib ibn ʿAbdallāh as a commander. And yet neither of them had the clout to be an effective deputy—Abū Dujāna because he was not a leader, and Ghālib because he had no constituency worth speaking of in Medina.

Second, we could expect that the strength of this motive would vary with certain features of the expeditions or their contexts. For example, one might speculate that Muḥammad needed more formidable deputies when he was first establishing his power in Medina than he did towards the end of his time there. And one might argue that it was indeed so from the fact that the two Saʿds are mentioned as serving only for the first and second expeditions. But other plausible hypotheses of this kind fare less well. One would be that Muḥammad's need for deputies with clout would correlate with the distance the expedition was taking him from Medina. But here no clear pattern emerges: if we take the seven expeditions that went more than a hundred miles or so from Medina,³⁴⁸ we find that the great majority of the deputies named by our three authors are low in clout. Yet another expected correlation might be with the size of the expeditions—the larger the expedition, the fewer reliable supporters of Muḥammad would remain in Medina, and the more he would need a deputy with clout. But the fact that the two alternative deputies for the Faḥ—an occasion for which Muḥammad assembled the largest force he had yet brought together—were Ibn Umm Maktūm and Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī is not encouraging: the first lacked clout altogether, and the second lacked it in Medina.

Finally, if military optimization was a serious concern for Muḥammad, we would expect this to be manifested in his choice of commanders for the expeditions he sent out when he himself stayed at home; and as we will see below, it was not.³⁴⁹

So what was Muḥammad thinking?

From the discussion so far it is hard to avoid the conclusion that for the most part Muḥammad preferred not to appoint deputies with the experience and clout needed to take care of Medina in his absence. This is the obvious way to understand many of his choices, notably his repeated use of Ibn Umm Maktūm and of members of minor tribes from outside Mecca and Medina. The apparent job-description of the deputies would seem to reinforce this: the strong emphasis on leading the communal prayer, and the fact that even when a different role is indicated we are almost never told just what it is. So also would the finding that according to our sources over half the deputies serve only once, and that apart from Ibn Umm Maktūm none serve more than four times at the most.³⁵⁰

348. Nos. 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27. Another way to approach this point would be to look for a correlation between the clout of deputies and the duration of Muḥammad's absences.

349. See the following subsection.

350. See above, text to note 317.

A deputy with some clout who served repeatedly would be in a position to build up a set of understandings and arrangements that he could activate each time he served. But no deputy other than Ibn Umm Maktūm was given the opportunity to do this, and nothing we know about Ibn Umm Maktūm suggests that he had the capacity to use the position in such a way. Why then did Muḥammad usually prefer not to appoint deputies with clout?³⁵¹

There are two possible motives here. One concerns the community at large, and the other Muḥammad in particular.

With regard to the community at large, Muḥammad's concern could have been to maintain the balance between the various elements of his community—or more precisely, to avoid the kind of imbalance that could alienate some part of it.³⁵² By definition a deputy with clout has a constituency, and the more his appointment pleases his constituency, the more it is likely to create resentment in other constituencies. Up to this point we have thought of a deputy with clout as someone who can *rein in* trouble if it occurs on his watch; but perhaps we should rather think of him as someone liable to *provoke* trouble. By contrast, a blind pietist or a member of an insignificant tribe could be relied on not to make waves in this way. The same consideration—the desire not to alienate—would apply to Muḥammad's treatment of the most powerful individuals in the community. A couple of years after his death, when the dying Abū Bakr (ruled 11–13/632–4) appointed 'Umar as his successor, Abū Bakr is said to have made the acid comment: "I have entrusted your affairs to him who I feel is the best of you. Each of you has a swollen nose because of that, for each wants the succession to be his instead."³⁵³ A swollen nose is a symptom of rage.³⁵⁴ We can readily imagine that temperaments were not much different a few years earlier, and that appointing deputies who lacked clout was a good way to avoid swollen noses. All this may reflect the rather flat social structure of Arabian tribal society, and its consequent allergy to strong leadership.³⁵⁵

With regard to Muḥammad himself, his concern could have been to secure his own position by avoiding arrangements that would enable any of his followers to accumulate too much power. The pattern of his appointments of deputies is certainly compatible with a concern to avoid the emergence of overmighty subjects (to employ a term that goes back to the English civil wars of the fifteenth century). Again, we may detect a similar concern at work in the years following Muḥammad's death.³⁵⁶ At the same time anecdotal evidence

351. Of course we would also like to be able to explain why he did sometimes appoint deputies with clout.

352. In response to a questioner in Maryland, I went back to the data to see if I could discern a pattern of alternation between different constituencies in successive appointments of deputies and commanders. But such a pattern is not in evidence.

353. Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, I/2139.10 = *History*, 11:148 (*fa-kullukum warima anfuḥu min dhālika, yurīdu an yakūna 'l-amr lahu dūnahu*); for a variant text, see Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh madīnat Dimashq*, 30:420.21.

354. For this idiom see Lane, *Lexicon*, 3052a.

355. In contrast, for example, to steppe nomads, where a clear distinction between nobles and commoners was to be found (Crone, *Slaves on horses*, 19f, 22f).

356. Speaking of the "peer-group" of senior Companions in this period, Ella Landau-Tasserón remarks that as a rule these people did not leave the Ḥijāz, and gives as one possible explanation for this the Caliph's anxiety that if such grandees were to settle in the provinces, they might amass enough power to contest his

about other aspects of the life of Muḥammad would fit this. Consider, for example, the way he handles Abū Bakr—one of his closest associates, the father of his favourite wife, and his eventual successor—on the eve of the Faṭḥ. For good reason Muḥammad made it a practice to keep the destination of his expeditions secret so that the enemy should not have advance warning.³⁵⁷ Yet one might have assumed that in planning the Faṭḥ, Muḥammad would have taken someone like Abū Bakr into his confidence. But what we are told is that Abū Bakr learnt of the impending expedition only by chance: he happened one day to visit his daughter ʿĀʾisha, and found her preparing Muḥammad's military equipment (*jahāz*). Even she did not know the destination of the expedition.³⁵⁸ The story is telling, though it could of course represent a later concern to minimize the role of Abū Bakr in the affairs of the community.

It is not easy to find evidence that would enable us to choose unambiguously between these two explanations, and perhaps both were in play. Indications from other aspects of Muḥammad's life could be expected to help here, and the most obvious comparison would be with the commanders of expeditions whom Muḥammad appointed when he himself stayed at home in Medina. In fact our information about commanders is likely to be more reliable than what we are told about deputies, and this for two reasons.³⁵⁹ The first is that it is attested earlier; thus Ibn Hishām's data for commanders, as not for deputies, regularly go back to Ibn Ishāq. The second is that there is considerably more agreement between Ibn Hishām and Wāqidī about commanders than there is about deputies; while Ibn Hishām has only thirty-seven expeditions that went out under commanders to Wāqidī's fifty-two, in all the thirty-four cases where Ibn Hishām includes an expedition in his main narrative sequence, he names the same commander as Wāqidī.³⁶⁰ So the data on the commanders are well worth attention. Again, one might have expected Muḥammad to cultivate a small number of tried and tested commanders whom he used repeatedly, or even a single commander-in-chief—much as Joshua serves as Moses' commander-in-chief in the Pentateuch. But that is far from what we find. This is not the place to consider the subject in detail, but several points are worth making by way of comparing deputies and commanders.

The first is that in general we see a similar tendency to avoid the repeated use of the same commander. If we go by Wāqidī's data, we have a total of fifty-two expeditions; twenty-five of them are led by twenty-five commanders who serve only once, ten by five

authority ("From tribal society to centralized polity", 193f).

357. W 990.8; SS 3-4:516.7 = SG 602.

358. SS 3-4:397.15 = SG 544; but see also W 796.9 (and note that here *jahhaza* refers to the preparation of provisions).

359. As pointed out to me by an anonymous reader, in the case of Muḥammad's commanders—as opposed to his deputies—we also get a sliver of apparently independent information in a non-Muslim source, though it does not help us with our present concerns. The context seems to be the expedition that was defeated by Byzantine forces at the Battle of Mu'ta (Theophanes, *Chronographia*, 1:335.12 = trans. Mango and Scott, 466; Hoyland, *Theophilus of Edessa's chronicle*, 91, and see 92 n. 177).

360. For the present purpose there would be no point in extending the comparison to Khalīfa, since for commanders his standard source is Ibn Ishāq.

commanders who serve twice, and nine by three commanders who serve three times.³⁶¹ If we go by the information provided in Ibn Hishām's work, we have a total of thirty-seven expeditions that Muḥammad did not himself command; nineteen of these were led by nineteen commanders who served only once, twelve by six commanders who served only twice.³⁶² Here, for comparison, is the proportion of all deputies and all commanders who serve once only; I express the ratios as percentages, for what they are worth:

DEPUTIES

Wāqidī	58%
Ibn Hishām	60%

COMMANDERS

Wāqidī	74%
Ibn Hishām	73%

In other words, Muḥammad would appear to have been even less concerned to maximize previous experience in the job for his commanders than he was for his deputies.³⁶³

Another way to make the same basic point is to pick out from Muḥammad's commanders those men who a decade or so later would be the leading generals of the Arab conquests: Abū 'Ubayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ, a prominent figure in the conquest of Syria; 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, the conqueror of Egypt; Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, who played a key role in the conquest of Iraq; and Khālid ibn al-Walīd, a major figure on both the Syrian and Iraqi fronts. If these men had an unusual talent for military leadership at the time of the conquests, they very likely possessed it already in the days of Muḥammad. So how often did he appoint them as commanders?

Abū 'Ubayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ	<i>twice</i>
'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ	<i>once</i>
Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ	<i>once</i>
Khālid ibn al-Walīd	<i>twice or thrice</i>

This result is particularly striking in the case of Abū 'Ubayda and Sa'd, both of whom had converted long before Muḥammad began mounting expeditions. 'Amr and Khālid, by contrast, converted only in 8/629;³⁶⁴ but at this point there were still expeditions to come—

361. I extracted Wāqidī's data from his introductory list (W 2–7). For the moment I leave aside a single outlier, Zayd ibn Ḥāritha.

362. I collected Ibn Ishāq's data scattered through Ibn Hishām's *Sīra*, where they regularly go back to Ibn Ishāq. Again I leave aside the single outlier, Zayd ibn Ḥāritha.

363. We could rework the figures to show the proportion of *occasions* on which Muḥammad delegated to a deputy or commander who had *not served before*. For deputies the ratio is twelve out of twenty-seven, or 44%, for Wāqidī, and fifteen out of twenty-seven, or 56%, for Ibn Hishām. For commanders, the ratio is thirty-four out of fifty-two, or 65%, for Wāqidī, and twenty-six out of thirty-seven, or 70%, for Ibn Hishām.

364. For their conversions see W 743.16, 748.17; SS 3-4:277.22 = SG 485; for the date, see W 745.16.

seventeen according to Wāqidī, anything between three and ten according to Ibn Hishām (the ambiguity arises from the fact that he leaves several expeditions undated).

Seen in purely military terms, none of this makes much sense. Even a naturally talented commander needs time to build up experience and bond with his men. The implication is that the motivation for the dispersal of military leadership was not military but political. As with the deputies, Muḥammad clearly liked to spread delegated authority thinly.³⁶⁵

The second point concerns the remaining expeditions—eight in Wāqidī's count and six in Ibn Hishām's. These are the expeditions led by Zayd ibn Ḥāritha,³⁶⁶ which make him the counterpart of Ibn Umm Maktūm among the deputies. Once again, seen from a purely military point of view, this could not have been an optimal arrangement: Zayd's servile origins were no doubt a significant element in the resentment his leadership is said to have inspired—a resentment echoed in accounts of the reactions of some the women Muḥammad pressed to marry Zayd. But in political terms the advantage of the arrangement was obvious: Zayd was a dependant of Muḥammad without strong links to the wider community. Muḥammad's choice of Zayd as a frequent commander is certainly compatible with a desire to avoid the trouble that could be stirred up by appointing commanders with constituencies, but it is even more in tune with the wish to avoid the emergence of overmighty subjects. It can hardly be accidental that the only commander whom Muḥammad appointed repeatedly—in contrast to his regular pattern of dispersing delegated authority—should have been his own freedman, and that he was not deflected from this by the resentment it created among his followers.³⁶⁷ In this respect it would not be out of place to see Zayd as the first *mamlūk* commander in Islamic history.

The third point, or rather set of points, concerns the distribution of appointees between our three main tribal categories: Qurashīs, Anṣārīs, and members of other tribes. (We are concerned here with the number of individuals who served or may have served as deputies, not with the number of expeditions.) Here are the figures:

	Qurashīs	Anṣārīs	Others	(Locals)	Total
DEPUTIES:					
Wāqidī	3	5	4	(3)	12
Ibn Hishām	4	5	6	(5)	15

365. A more thorough study of Muḥammad's commanders than is attempted here would need to consider whether other factors might have contributed to the dispersal, such as the need for commanders to be familiar with the territory to which they were being sent, or to have connections with the relevant tribes (I owe both these suggestions to Ella Landau-Tasseron).

366. We are also told on the authority of Wāqidī that Zayd commanded seven expeditions (Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:1:31.5; the number "nine" given at 31.9 is very likely a corruption of "seven"). A list of his expeditions given by Ibn Sa'd (31.13), again on the authority of Wāqidī, agrees with what we find in Wāqidī's listing except in omitting the expedition to Wādī 'l-Qurā in 6/627 (for which see W 5.6; there seems to be no account of this expedition in the body of the work).

367. An alternative explanation that has been suggested to me for Muḥammad's choice of Zayd—and others lacking in clout—is that he intended to make a moral or meritocratic point against the prevailing tribal order of society. Such a motive is not to be ruled out, but given the pronounced pragmatic streak with which Muḥammad is portrayed in the sources, I doubt whether it is sufficient to explain the pattern.

	Qurashīs	Anṣārīs	Others	(Locals)	Total
COMMANDERS					
Wāqidī	12	9	13	(4)	34
Ibn Hishām	11	5	10	(5)	26

So what do we notice? First, among the deputies Anṣārīs outnumber Qurashīs, whereas among commanders Qurashīs outnumber Anṣārīs. This is just what we would expect given the differing roles of the two groups in Muḥammad’s polity. The Qurashīs were both closer to him and initially less well-placed to make a living in Medina than the Anṣārīs, making them more likely to participate in expeditions; and the Anṣārīs were naturally better informed about the politics of their own oasis. Second, the proportion of members of other tribes is about the same for both deputies and commanders, namely a third or a little over; here is the proportion, again expressed as a percentage, for what it is worth:

DEPUTIES	
Wāqidī	33%
Ibn Hishām	40%

COMMANDERS	
Wāqidī	38%
Ibn Hishām	38%

In other words, Muḥammad here shows the same tendency to disperse authority that we saw when we looked just now at the figures for expeditions, and the same lack of concern for the social and political clout of those to whom he delegates. Third, whereas the category of “others” is dominated by members of the local tribes in the case of the deputies, this is not the case for the commanders, who are recruited from a considerably wider range of tribal groups,³⁶⁸ thereby contributing further to the pattern of dispersal.

The bottom line of this comparison of deputies and commanders is that if Muḥammad appoints commanders in a militarily suboptimal fashion for political reasons, then we should not be surprised to find him doing something similar in appointing deputies. In other words, it would seem that we have uncovered a feature that may well characterize his delegation of authority in general.³⁶⁹ How are we to explain this pattern? In some measure it might reflect Muḥammad’s own personality. To some extent it could reflect

368. In the case of the deputies, the local tribes are Ghifār for Wāqidī, and the same plus Layth and Du’īl for Ibn Hishām. In the case of the commanders they are Murra ibn ‘Abdmanāt, Layth, Sulaym, and Ghifār for Wāqidī, and the same plus Aslam for Ibn Hishām. Leaving aside the special case of Zayd ibn Ḥāritha and his son Usama, the non-local tribes are as follows. In the case of the deputies, there are none. In the case of the commanders they are Asad (thrice), Quḍā’a, Kilāb, Ghanī, and Fazāra for Wāqidī, and Asad (twice) and Fazāra for Ibn Hishām.

369. In this connection it would be worth looking at his appointments of agents—governors or tax-collectors—to deal with outlying tribes, but I have not attempted to do this.

cross-pressures that any leader needing to delegate is subject to.³⁷⁰ But the main reason is likely to have been the character of Arabian society, located as it was in a desert environment where the scarcity of material resources meant that power was typically more personal than institutional.

We have been concerned in this paper with a relatively obscure aspect of the way Muḥammad ran his state, but it does have a couple of implications for what came after. First, though we are unlikely ever to be in a position to reconstruct Muḥammad's expectations of the future in the last years of his life, the fact is that someone so reluctant to delegate to a single person on a regular basis was unlikely to groom a successor.³⁷¹ Contrast the Biblical image of Moses: he has a track-record of delegation, and in response to divine instructions he enhances the authority of Joshua in anticipation of his own death. From this point of view the surprise is not that Muḥammad's death precipitated a succession crisis, but that the crisis was so quickly resolved. Second, no law-giver operating in the Arabian environment with Muḥammad's political style was likely to leave a well-developed array of institutions occupying the space between himself and those he ruled.³⁷² In this respect we might contrast him with an earlier lawgiver, Solon. A different man in a different environment, in the early sixth century BC he devised a dense array of political institutions for the citizens of the Greek city state of Athens, and then voluntarily departed from the city for ten years.³⁷³ Not so Muḥammad, and here we plausibly have one root of the relative scarcity of formal institutional structures in the early Islamic polity.

370. The cross-pressures discussed in this paper are not the only ones that can arise. Jennifer Davis writes of Charlemagne's delegation of judicial authority to multiple provincial officials: "This may not have been the most efficient approach to governance, but it left ample room for creativity, adaptation, personal dynamics and flexibility" (Davis, "Pattern for power", 246). A somewhat similar point is made by Beatrice Manz about Timur's style of government (Manz, "Administration and the delegation of authority", 206f). Both scholars are making the point that it may be advantageous for a ruler *not* to maximize efficiency.

371. As pointed out to me by an anonymous reader, if Muḥammad did in fact believe the end of the world to be at hand, that could be another reason for his omitting to groom a successor. For a recent discussion of the imminence of "the Hour" in parts of the Koran, see Shoemaker, *Death of a prophet*, 160–3; for early traditions exhibiting the same tendency, see 172–8.

372. Pre-Islamic Arabia was not devoid of institutions as such. A notable example is the Ḥums, a Meccan institution that has been described as "a community made up of various tribal groups, united by religious beliefs and customs that marked it off from others"; but it lacked a formal central authority, coercive power, or a fiscal role (Landau-Tasseron, "From tribal society to centralized polity", 182). By contrast, a striking account of a king ruling over his clan in Medina three generations before the arrival of Muḥammad presupposes that he had neither bodyguards nor a retinue (Lecker, "King Ubayy and the *quṣṣās*", 33–5).

373. See Aristotle, "Athenian constitution", chapter 11, in Warrington (trans.), *Aristotle's Politics*, 253.

Appendix

In this appendix I survey the data regarding deputies found in twenty-three later sources. My coverage of such sources is by no means comprehensive, but those I have consulted are likely to be fairly representative of what is available. They date from the fifth/eleventh century to the eleventh/seventeenth. Note that when I remark in this appendix that an author follows Wāqidī or Ibn Hishām, or use wordings similar to this, I am not implying that he takes his data directly from either source, or that he acknowledges such dependence. My impression, for what it is worth, is that few if any of these authors had direct access to the text of Wāqidī's *Maghāzī*.

Māwardī (d. 450/1058) in his compendium of Shāfi'ite law includes accounts of Muḥammad's expeditions (*Ḥāwī*, 14:23–91) in the course of which he generally names the deputy. Leaving aside three cases where he does not do so, we find that he departs from Wāqidī's data as found in our text of the *Maghāzī* only with regard to two expeditions. One is the Faṭḥ, for which he names Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī (64.6); the other is Tabūk, for which he names Muḥammad ibn Maslama (82.25). The first agrees with Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa, the second with Ibn Sa'd. Typically, neither of these departures from Wāqidī's data involves the naming of a person we have not already encountered as a deputy for one expedition or another.

Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) and Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) in their closely related works on the biography of Muḥammad name the deputies for all but six of the expeditions they cover—the same six in each case (Ibn Ḥazm, *Jawāmi'*, 100–262; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Durar*, 103–284). The names they give are those of Ibn Hishām with a single exception: they include 'Alī as an alternative for the Tabūk expedition (*Jawāmi'*, 251.6; *Durar*, 254.9, where Ibn 'Abd al-Barr goes on to remark that this is the most reliable view). There are also some minor points of interest. Thus with regard to the appointment of Ibn Umm Maktūm as deputy for the Battle of Uḥud, they echo Ibn Hishām (SS 3-4:64.1 = SG 752 no. 583) in specifying that this was to conduct the prayer of those Muslims who remained in Medina (*lil-ṣalāt bi-man baqiya bi'l-Madīna min al-Muslimīn*, *Jawāmi'*, 157.8; similarly *Durar*, 154.11). With regard to the Battle of the Khandaq, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr ascribes the information that Ibn Umm Maktūm was the deputy to Ibn Shihāb (*Durar*, 181.7), that is to say to Zuhri (d. 124/742). For the relationship between the two works see Jarrar, *Prophetenbiographie*, 169–73.

The elder Ibn Rushd (d. 520/1126) gives an account of Muḥammad's expeditions (*al-Bayān wa'l-taḥṣīl*, 17:424–79) in which he names the deputy only once, for the Ḥajjat al-wadā', as Abū Dujāna or, it is said, Sibā' ibn 'Urfuṭa (478.20); this agrees with Ibn Hishām against Wāqidī and Khalīfa. There is a parallel passage in his later work *al-Muqaddimāt wa'l-mumahhidāt*, 3:387.13.

Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1154) includes a substantial biography of Muḥammad in his *I'ān al-warā'*, but in his treatment of his expeditions (163–263) he rarely identifies the deputy. Predictably—since he is a Shī'ite, in fact the only one considered in this appendix—he names 'Alī as deputy over Medina for the Tabūk campaign (243.18, citing the *manzila* tradition, 244.7). More unusual is his deputy for the Faṭḥ, Abū Lubāba (218.20); we have

encountered this only in Yaʿqūbī (see above, text to note 85).

Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201) in his chronicle gives accounts of the various expeditions in which he regularly identifies the deputy (*Muntaẓam*, 2:202–449). The names he gives agree with Wāqidī's with one exception: for the Battle of Badr he mentions not just Abū Lubāba (208.23), as Wāqidī does, but also Ibn Umm Maktūm (208.19). In thus naming both he is in line with Ibn Hishām and Khalīfa.

Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) gives accounts of Muḥammad's expeditions in his chronicle (*Kāmil*, 2:7–167), naming the deputy for a bit over half of them. Except in one instance his data agree with those of Wāqidī; the exception is the Faṭḥ, where he is in agreement with Ibn Hishām against Wāqidī (117.25).

Kalāʿī (d. 634/1237) in his account of Muḥammad's expeditions in the second volume of his *Iktifāʾ* does not to my knowledge mention any deputies.

Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) in his *Muḥāḍarat al-abrār* gives a list of deputies in which he reproduces the data of Ibn Hishām (1:75–7). He wrongly includes the expedition to Rajīʿ (in the year 4/625) as one led by Muḥammad (76.5), but the only point of real interest is a terminological one already noted (see above, text to note 25).

Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭī (d. 705/1306) gives brief accounts of the expeditions in his short biography of Muḥammad (*al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, 185–255).³⁷⁴ His data are those of Wāqidī; that he opts for Muḥammad ibn Maslama as the best-founded claimant to the deputyship for Tabūk (250.2) leads us to suspect that his access to Wāqidī was through Ibn Saʿd, and the wording he uses confirms this (*wa-huwa athbat mimman qāla ʾstakhlafa ghayrahu*, see above, note 75).

Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333) gives an account of the expeditions in his encyclopaedic compendium (*Nihāyat al-arab*, 17:4–378). He brings together data deriving from both Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām. His access to Wāqidī is through Ibn Saʿd, as is indicated both by his references to him and by his naming the deputy for Tabūk as Muḥammad ibn Maslama without qualification (354.9). The only discrepancy is that on the authority of Ibn Saʿd he names Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī as deputy for the ʿUmrāt al-qaḍāʾ (376.6); Ibn Saʿd in fact names Abū Ruhm al-Ghifārī (*Ṭabaqāt*, 2:1:87.18), though as we have seen Abū Dharr is named by Balādhurī. Nuwayrī sometimes attributes Ibn Hishām's data to Ibn Ishāq.

Ibn Sayyid al-Nās (d. 734/1334) in his biography of Muḥammad gives accounts of his expeditions (*ʿUyūn al-athar*, 1:270–2:354). He regularly names the deputy, usually citing Ibn Hishām, but occasionally citing or following Ibn Saʿd.

Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) in the first volume of his *Taʾrīkh al-Islām* gives accounts of the expeditions (47–711), naming the deputy for about half of them. In these cases he follows Wāqidī or Ibn Hishām.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) in his *Zād al-maʿād* gives accounts of the expeditions (3:164–548) in the course of which he generally names the deputy, usually in agreement with Ibn Hishām but sometimes with Wāqidī.

Mughulṭāy ibn Qilīj (d. 762/1361) has two relevant works. In one, *al-Zahr al-bāsim*, he

374. The title is the editor's; Dimyāṭī himself gives his work no formal title, but describes it as a brief book about the life of the Prophet (*kitāb mukhtaṣar fī sirat al-nabī*, see *al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, 25.3).

mentions deputies sporadically in his accounts of the expeditions (880–1407), drawing on the data of Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām; there are only a couple of points of interest here, already noted in connection with the deputyship of Abū Lubāba for the Badr campaign (see above, note 49). In the other work, the *Ishāra*, he names deputies for most expeditions (190–346), basing himself on the data of Wāqidī supplemented with information deriving from Ibn Hishām; the one exception is that he mentions ‘Alī in connection with the Tabūk expedition (337.2).

Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) in his chronicle gives an expansive account of the expeditions (*Bidāya*, 3:190–5:163). He regularly names the deputy, following Ibn Hishām and attributing the information to him. He rarely cites Wāqidī for a deputy (as at 3:194.8, 195.17); he is in agreement with him in mentioning Sibā‘ ibn ‘Urfuṭa as deputy for the Khaybar campaign, but derives the information from the tradition of Abū Hurayra (4:147.17).

Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406) covers the expeditions in his *Ibar* (2:744–841). He usually names the deputy, following Ibn Hishām faithfully despite a couple of corruptions and the addition of ‘Alī as an alternative for Tabūk (820.5).

Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) in his work on the biography of the Prophet gives a list of deputies (*Imtā‘ al-asmā‘*, 9:227.3) that mostly follows Wāqidī, but diverges in some places. With regard to two expeditions there seems to be confusion between Abū Salama and Abū Lubāba (227.6). For the ‘Umrāt al-qaḍā’ he names Abū Dharr, like Balādhurī (227.22; cf. above, text to note 83); his alternatives for expeditions, when not simply those of Wāqidī, are shared with Balādhurī (as in the cases of Ḥudaybiya and Tabūk, where he mentions Abū Ruhm, 227.14, 227.16). He also assigns a deputy in connection with activity following the conquest of Khaybar that is not usually recognized as a separate expedition (227.21). The list is clearly incomplete: five expeditions are not covered, including Badr (with regard to the deputyship over Medina) and the Faḥḥ; two of these missing expeditions no doubt belong in the lacuna that clearly follows the mention of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān (227.19). Earlier in the work Maqrīzī identifies the deputy in his accounts of most of the individual expeditions (1:73–2:120); the names he gives are predominantly Wāqidī’s, with occasional divergences that align him with Ibn Hishām and, in one instance, Balādhurī (1:331.11). A couple of minor points of interest have already been noted (see above, notes 14, 333).

Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) in his history of Medina provides a list of deputies (*al-Tuḥfa al-laṭīfa*, 1:64.18–65.16). For the most part he clearly draws on Wāqidī and Ibn Hishām, but at two points he diverges. First, he says that Ibn Ishāq names the deputy for Muraysī‘ as “Ji‘āl al-Ḍumayrī” (64.22); this must be Ji‘āl (or Ju‘āl or Ju‘ayl) ibn Surāqa al-Ḍamrī, who is not otherwise known as a deputy (for his biography see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 245f no. 329, 274 no. 360; Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:180f; he was poor and very ugly). The claim that he was deputy for the Musaysī‘ expedition is incompatible with the statement of Ibn Sa‘d that Ji‘āl was present on this raid (*Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:181.14 on the authority of Wāqidī). He is not known to the genealogists, and his tribal affiliation is somewhat uncertain: the *nisba* “Ḍamrī” implies of course that he belonged to Ḍamra, which was part of Kināna (see T36 and T42); we also find him with the *nisba* “Ghifārī” (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 245.9 no. 329), implying that he belonged to Ghifār, itself part of Ḍamra. But then again he is described as a Tha‘labī (presumably referring to one or other of the tribal

groups that might be spoken of as Banū Tha‘laba), and is also said to have been reckoned (‘*adīd*) with the Banū Sawād, who belonged to the Khazrajī clan of the Banū Salima (Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 4:1:180.24; see T190)—implying that he was something less than a full member of the group. Sakhāwī’s source for Jī‘āl’s deputyship is most likely Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Iṣāba*, 1:482.1; Ibn Ḥajar there gives the same information on the authority of Ibn Ishāq about Jī‘āl’s role as deputy for the Muraysī‘ expedition (with the correct spelling of the *nisba*), followed by the remark that it is contradicted by a report of Mūsā ibn ‘Uqba’s placing Jī‘āl with the expedition (just as we have seen Ibn Sa‘d says). Ibn Ḥajar in turn is likely to have taken the report from Ibn al-Athīr’s dictionary of Companions (*Usd al-ghāba*, 1:284.9). Here, however, there is no mention of Ibn Ishāq, who in any case says no such thing in his work as we know it; instead Ibn al-Athīr gives his source as “Abū Mūsā to Ibn Manda” without reproducing Abū Mūsā’s *isnād*.³⁷⁵ If we were to take Jī‘āl’s alleged deputyship seriously, he would fit easily into the set of deputies belonging to the local tribes. Second, Sakhāwī notes that it is said that the deputy for the ‘Umrat al-qaḍā’ was Bashīr ibn Sa‘d al-Anṣārī (*al-Tuḥfa al-laṭīfa*, 1:65.14); this Bashīr was a Ḥārithī, more broadly a Khazrajī (T188; for his biography, see *EP*³, art. “Bashīr b. Sa‘d” (M. Lecker); Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb*, 172f no. 193; Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:83f). By contrast, Wāqidi shows Bashīr as with the expedition: Muḥammad put him in charge (*ista‘mala*) of the weapons (*silāh*) (W 733.10; Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Sachau, 3:2:84.5). One accordingly wonders whether the use of the verb *ista‘mala* here could have led to confusion (compare the case of Nājiya, above, note 98). He died in battle in the Caliphate of Abū Bakr (ruled 11–13/632–4) (84.7), and had descendants (83.17).

Diyārbakrī (writing c. 940/1534) in his biography of Muḥammad covers the expeditions (*Ta’rīkh al-khamīs*, 1:363–2:153) and regularly names the deputy, mixing data from Ibn Hishām and Wāqidi. Like many authors, he adds ‘Alī as a possible deputy for Tabūk, citing Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī (d. 806/1404) and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (2:125.14). More noteworthy is that he names an alternative to Ibn Umm Maktūm for the Battle of Uḥud who is not to my knowledge found in other sources: an unidentifiable Ibn Abī Mikraz (1:422.6). Given the consensus that the deputy for Uḥud was Ibn Umm Maktūm—no other source names an alternative—it is perhaps not to be ruled out that “Ibn Abī Mikraz” is a corrupt doublet of “Ibn Umm Maktūm”.

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1044/1635) in his biography of Muḥammad (commonly known as *al-Sīra al-Ḥalabiyya*) devotes considerable attention to his expeditions (*Insān al-‘uyūn*, 2:347–3:133) and to the Ḥajj al-wadā‘ (3:307–40). He regularly names the deputy, bringing together the data of Ibn Hishām and Wāqidi, and adding a couple of variants that we have encountered in Balādhurī (Abū Ruhm for Ḥudaybiya, 2:689.6, and Abū Dharr for the ‘Umrat al-qaḍā’, 780.5). For Tabūk he mentions ‘Alī (3:102.5). As we have seen, the most

375. The reference is to the additions of Abū Mūsā Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Abī ‘Isā al-Iṣfahānī (d. 581/1185) to the *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba* of Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Manda (d. 395/1005). For Ibn Manda’s work see Sezgin, *Geschichte*, 1:215 no. 1; for the biography of Abū Mūsā see Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 21:152–9 no. 78 (and for his *Dhayl Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba* see 154.8). That Abū Mūsā’s work expanded the *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba* of Ibn Manda, and not that of Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, is apparent from Ibn al-Athīr’s introduction to his *Usd al-ghāba* (1:4.3); he cites Abū Mūsā’s work with great frequency in the body of the *Usd al-ghāba*.

interesting thing he offers us is an explicit conception of dual deputyships (see above, text to notes 342-6).

I have also scanned the entries on each of the members of my pool of deputies in the standard dictionaries of Companions, and noted any significant points. As the reader will have seen, I cite the *Istīʿāb* of Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) as my biographical source of first resort. I have skimmed the relevant entries in the *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba* of Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī (d. 430/1038), the *Usd al-ghāba* of Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233), and the *Iṣāba* of Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449), but I rarely have occasion to cite them.

Going back to the twenty-three works covered above, the overall results of this survey could be summed up as follows. Overwhelmingly their data derive directly or indirectly from Wāqidī, Ibn Hishām, or both. When they do diverge, they often do so in ways already attested in other early sources, notably Balādhurī. Yet every now and again the later sources give us information (or misinformation) not found in the early sources available to us, raising at least the possibility that they may be preserving old information otherwise lost to us (rather than corrupting information we already have). The most striking example of this is Sakhāwī, an author of the ninth/fifteenth century who names two deputies that are entirely new to us. Occasionally later authors are interesting because they are innovative; Ḥalabī is the leading instance of this.

List of Works Cited

ʿAbd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī, *Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥ. al-Aʿzamī, Beirut 1970–2.

Abū Bakr ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī, *Fahrassa*, ed. F. Codera and J. Ribera Tarrago, Beirut n.d.

Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, ed. M. M. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, n.p n.d.

Abū ʿl-Layth al-Samarqandī, *Tafsīr*, ed. ʿA. M. Muʿawwaḍ and others, Beirut 1993.

Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba*, ed. ʿA. Y. al-ʿAzāzī, Riyadh 1998.

ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī, al-, *Minhāj al-karāma*, in Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya*, ed. M. R. Sālim, vol. 1, Cairo 1962.

Arazi, A., “Les enfants adultérins [*daʿīs*] dans la société arabe ancienne: l’aspect littéraire”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 16 (1993).

Aristotle, “The Athenian constitution”, in J. Warrington (trans.), *Aristotle’s Politics and Athenian Constitution*, London 1959.

Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, ed. M. F. al-ʿAzam, Damascus 1997–2010.

Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, vol. 1, ed. M. Ḥamīd Allāh, Cairo 1959.

Bayhaqī, *Dalāʾil al-nubuwwa*, ed. ʿA. Qalʿajī, Beirut 1985.

- Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, Hyderabad 1344–55.
- Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-awsaṭ*, ed. M. I. al-Luḥaydān, Riyadh 1998.
- Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, Hyderabad 1360–98.
- Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-ṣaghīr*, ed. M. I. Zāyid, Aleppo 1976–7.
- Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Q. al-Shammāʿī al-Rifāʿī, Beirut 1987.
- Caetani, L., *Annali dell'Islām*, Milan 1905–26.
- Cameron, A. J., *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī: an examination of his image in the hagiography of Islam*, London 1973.
- Caskel, W., *Ġamharat an-nasab: das genealogische Werk des Hišām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī*, Leiden 1966 (tables abbreviated T).
- Crone, P., *Meccan trade and the rise of Islam*, Princeton 1987.
- Crone, P., *Slaves on horses: the evolution of the Islamic polity*, Cambridge 1980.
- Davis, J. R., “A pattern for power: Charlemagne’s delegation of judicial responsibilities”, in J. R. Davis and M. McCormick (ed.), *The long morning of medieval Europe: new directions in early medieval studies*, Aldershot 2008.
- Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. S. al-Arnaʿūṭ and others, Beirut 1981–8.
- Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh al-Islām*, ed. ʿU. ʿA. Tadmurī, Beirut 1987–2000.
- Dimyāṭī, Sharaf al-Dīn al-, *al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. A. M. al-Ṭayyib, Aleppo 1997.
- Diyārbakrī, *Taʾrīkh al-khamīs*, Cairo 1283.
- EI*² = *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, second edition.
- EI*³ = *Encyclopaedia of Islam three*.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam*, second edition, Leiden 1960–2009 (abbreviated *EI*²).
- Encyclopaedia of Islam three*, Leiden 2007– (abbreviated *EI*³).
- Ḥalabī, ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-, *Insān al-ʿuyūn*, Cairo 1964.
- Horst, H., “Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar aṭ-Ṭabarīs”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 103 (1953).
- Hoyland, R. G., *Theophilus of Edessa’s chronicle and the circulation of historical knowledge in late antiquity and early Islam*, Liverpool 2011.
- Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Durar fī ikhtiṣār al-maghāzī waʾl-siyar*, ed. S. Ḍif, Cairo 1966.

- Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Istīʿāb fī maʿrifat al-Aṣḥāb*, ed. ʿA. M. al-Bujāwī, Cairo n.d.
- Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaf*, ed. S. al-Laḥḥām, Beirut 1989.
- Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn, *Muḥāḍarat al-abrār wa-musāmarat al-akhyār*, vol. 1, ed. M. M. al-Khūlī, Cairo 1972.
- Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, ed. ʿA. Shīrī, Beirut 1995–8.
- Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī ʿl-taʾrīkh*, ed. ʿU. ʿA. Tadmurī, Beirut 1997.
- Ibn al-Athīr, *Usd al-ghāba*, Cairo 1280–6.
- Ibn Durayd, *Ishtiqāq*, ed. ʿA. M. Hārūn, Cairo 1958.
- Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, ed. I. Lichtenstädter, Beirut n.d.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-Ṣaḥāba*, ed. ʿA. M. al-Bujāwī, Cairo 1970–2.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras*, ed. M. S. M. al-Mayādīnī, Beirut 1998.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-ʿIlal wa-maʿrifat al-rijāl*, ed. W. M. ʿAbbās, Beirut 1988.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, Būlāq 1313.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. S. al-Arnaʿūṭ and others (in *al-Mawsūʿa al-ḥadīthiyya*, ed. ʿA. ʿA. al-Turkī), Beirut 1993–2001.
- Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansāb al-ʿArab*, ed. ʿA. M. Hārūn, Cairo 1982.
- Ibn Ḥazm, *Jawāmiʿ al-sīra*, ed. I. ʿAbbās and N. al-Asad, Cairo n.d.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, Hyderabad 1973–83.
- Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. M. al-Saqqā and others, Cairo 1955 (abbreviated SS); trans. A. Guillaume as *The life of Muhammad*, Oxford 1955 (abbreviated SG).
- Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī tawārīkh al-mulūk waʿl-umam*, ed. S. Zakkār, Beirut 1995–6.
- Ibn al-Kalbī, *Jamharat al-nasab*, ed. N. Ḥasan, Beirut 1986; see also Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab*.
- Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya waʿl-nihāya*, ed. ʿA. M. Muʿawwaḍ and ʿA. A. ʿAbd al-Mawjūd, Beirut 1994.
- Ibn Khaldūn, *ʿIbar*, Beirut 1956–9.
- Ibn Mākūlā, *Ikmāl*, ed. ʿA. Y. al-Muʿallimī al-Yamānī, Hyderabad 1962–88.
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Zād al-maʿād*, ed. S. and ʿA. al-Arnaʿūṭ, Beirut 1979.
- Ibn Qudāma, *al-Istibṣār fī nasab al-Ṣaḥāba min al-Anṣār*, ed. ʿA. Nuwayhid, n.p. 1972.

- Ibn Rushd, *al-Bayān wa'l-taḥṣīl*, ed. M. Ḥajjī and others, Beirut 1984–91.
- Ibn Rushd, *al-Muqaddimāt al-mumahhidāt*, ed. M. Ḥajjī and S. A. A'rāb, Beirut 1988.
- Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, ed. E. Sachau and others, Leiden 1904–21.
- Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, ed. 'A. M. 'Umar, Cairo 2001.
- Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, *'Uyūn al-athar*, Beirut 1980.
- Ibn Shabba, *Ta'rīkh al-Madīna al-munawwara*, ed. F. M. Shaltūt, Beirut 1990.
- Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya*, Būlāq 1321–2.
- Jarrar, M., *Die Prophetenbiographie im islamischen Spanien: ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main 1989.
- Jones, J. M. B., "The chronology of the *maghāzī*—a textual survey", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 19 (1957).
- Kalā'ī, *al-Iktifā' bi-mā taḍammanahu min maghāzī Rasūl Allāh wa'l-thalātha al-khulafā'*, ed. M. K. 'I. 'Alī, Beirut 1997.
- Khalifa ibn Khayyāt, *Ta'rīkh*, ed. A. Ḍ. al-'Umarī, Najaf 1967.
- Kister, M. J., "The massacre of the Banū Qurayṣa: a re-examination of a tradition", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, vol. 8 (1986).
- Landau-Tasseron, E., "Adoption, acknowledgement of paternity and false genealogical claims in Arabian and Islamic societies", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 66 (2003).
- Landau-Tasseron, E., "Alliances among the Arabs", *Al-Qanṭara*, vol. 26 (2005).
- Landau-Tasseron, E., "Features of the pre-conquest Muslim army in the time of Muḥammad", in A. Cameron (ed.), *The Byzantine and early Islamic Near East: III: States, resources and armies*, Princeton 1995.
- Landau-Tasseron, E., "From tribal society to centralized polity: an interpretation of events and anecdotes of the formative period of Islam", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, vol. 24 (2000).
- Landau-Tasseron, E., "The status of allies in pre-Islamic and early Islamic Arabian society", *Islamic Law and Society*, vol. 13 (2006).
- Lane, E. W., *An Arabic-English lexicon*, London 1863–93.
- Lecker, M., "Idol worship in pre-Islamic Medina (Yathrib)", in M. Lecker, *Jews and Arabs in pre- and early Islamic Arabia*, Aldershot 1998, article I.

- Lecker, M., “King Ibn Ubayy and the *quṣṣāṣ*”, in M. Lecker, *People, tribes and society in Arabia around the time of Muḥammad*, Aldershot 2005, article II.
- Lecker, M., *Muslims, Jews and pagans: studies on early Islamic Medina*, Leiden 1995.
- Lecker, M., “*Wa-bi-Rādhān mā bi-Rādhān...: the landed property of ‘Abdallāh ibn Mas‘ūd*”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 78 (2015).
- Lecker, M., “Wāqidī’s account on the status of the Jews in Medina: a study of a combined report”, in M. Lecker, *Jews and Arabs in pre- and early Islamic Arabia*, Aldershot 1998, article VII.
- Madelung, W., *The succession to Muḥammad: a study of the early caliphate*, Cambridge 1997.
- Manz, B. F., “Administration and the delegation of authority in Temür’s dominions”, *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 20 (1976).
- Maqrīzī, *Imtā‘ al-asmā‘*, ed. M. ‘A. al-Numaysī, Beirut 1999.
- Mas‘ūdī, *al-Tanbīh wa’l-ishrāf*, ed. ‘A. I. al-Ṣāwī, Cairo 1938.
- Māwardī, *al-Ḥawī al-kabīr*, ed. ‘A. M. Mu‘awwaḍ and ‘A. A. ‘Abd al-Mawjūd, Beirut 1994.
- Miskinzoda, G., “The significance of the *ḥadīth* of the position of Aaron for the formulation of the Shī‘ī doctrine of authority”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 78 (2015).
- Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, ed. B. ‘A. Ma‘rūf, Beirut 1985–92.
- Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, ed. M. A. al-Dālī, Beirut 1986.
- Mufīd, al-Shaykh al-, *Irshād*, Qumm 1413; trans. I. K. A. Howard as *Kitāb al-irshād: the book of guidance into the lives of the Twelve Imams*, Horsham 1981.
- Mughulṭāy ibn Qilij, *al-Ishāra ilā sīrat al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. M. N. al-Futayyih, Damascus 1996.
- Mughulṭāy ibn Qilij, *al-Zahr al-bāsim fī sīrat Abī ‘l-Qāsim*, ed. A. A. ‘Abd al-Shakūr, Cairo 2012.
- Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, ed. É. Lévi-Provençal, Cairo 1976.
- Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab*, Cairo 1923–.
- Powers, D. S., *Zayd*, Philadelphia 2014.
- Qummī, *Tafsīr*, Beirut 1991.
- Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, Cairo c. 1934–62.
- Sakhāwī, *al-Tuḥfa al-laṭīfa fī ta’rīkh al-Madīna al-sharīfa*, Cairo 1957–8.

- Samhūdī, *Wafā' al-wafā bi-akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. Q. al-Sāmarrā'ī, London 2001.
- Sezgin, F., *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, Leiden 1967–2010.
- SG = Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, trans. Guillaume.
- Shoemaker, S. J., *The death of a prophet: the end of Muhammad's life and the beginnings of Islam*, Philadelphia 2012.
- SS = Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, ed. Saqqā and others.
- T = the tables of Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab*.
- Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, Beirut 1992.
- Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḫ al-rusul wa'l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje and others, Leiden 1879–1901; trans. F. Rosenthal and others as *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, Albany 1985–2007.
- Ṭabrisī, *I'ṭām al-warā*, Qumm 1417.
- Ṭabrisī, *Majma' al-bayān fi tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Qumm 1403.
- Tha'labī, *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*, Beirut n.d.
- Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1883–5; trans. C. Mango and R. Scott as *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, Oxford 1997.
- Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far, *al-Tibyān fi tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Najaf 1957–63.
- W = Wāqidi, *Maghāzī*.
- Wāqidi, *Maghāzī*, ed. M. Jones, London 1966 (abbreviated W); trans. R. Faizer and others as *The life of Muḥammad: al-Wāqidi's Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, London 2011.
- Wellhausen, J., *The Arab kingdom and its fall*, Beirut 1963.
- Ya'qūbī, *Ta'riḫ*, ed. M. T. Houtsma, Leiden 1883.
- Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, Beirut 1957.
- Zamakhsharī, *Kashshāf*, ed. 'A. A. 'Abd al-Mawjūd and 'A. M. Mu'awwad, Riyadh 1998.