

## THE EXPEDITION OF BI'R MA'ŪNA

The character of the expedition sent by the Prophet in the month of Safar 4 H.,<sup>1</sup> which ended in the killing of the participants at Bi'r Ma'ūna, is rather obscure. Traditions about this expedition are contradictory:<sup>2</sup> the aim of the expedition can hardly be determined; the number of the participants is variously stated in the divergent traditions; the tribal composition of the participants is disputed; the details about the attackers are few; the reason for their attack on the Muslim party is not clear. It may therefore be useful to present a survey of some of the traditions concerning this encounter, in course of which a version apparently hitherto unknown is presented.

### I

The traditional account of the story as reported by Ibn Ishāq (d. 151 H.)<sup>3</sup> forms a composite narrative, based on the authority of a number of Muslim traditionists. According to this account, one of the chiefs of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, Abū Barā' 'Āmir b. Mālik,<sup>4</sup> nicknamed "Mulā'ib al-Asinna" ("The Player with the Spears"),<sup>5</sup> came to the Prophet and was invited by him to accept Islam. Although he did not embrace Islam, he was not far removed from it. He asked the Prophet to send some of his Companions to Najd to summon its people to embrace Islam, and expressed the hope that they would respond. He assured the Prophet of his protection of the Companions. The Prophet sent forty of his Companions with al-Mundhir b. 'Amr

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. M. B. Jones, "The Chronology of the Maghāzī—a textual survey," in *BSOAS* (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* XXI, 1957), 249, 267: the anonymous tradition fixing the date of the expedition in Muharram (p. 249 n. 10) is quoted as well in Samhūdī's *Wafā' al-wafā'*, I, 211.

<sup>2</sup> See Max v. Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen*, rev. and ed. W. Caskel, III, 9.

<sup>3</sup> In Ibn Hishām's *Sīra*.

<sup>4</sup> See his biography in Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba* n° 4417.

<sup>5</sup> For this nickname, see Ibn al-Kalbī, *Ansāb al-Khail*, ed. Aḥmad Zakī Pasha (Cairo, 1946), 77; Aus b. Ḥajar, *Dīwān*, ed. Geyer, XVII, 7, 8; XXI, 3; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, *Iqd*, III (Cairo, 1935), 335; Yāqūt, *Buldān*, s.v. "Sullān"; al-Zurqānī; *Sharḥ 'alā 'l-mawāhib*, II (1325 H.), 75; al-Suhailī: *al-Rand al-unuf*, II (Cairo, 1914), 174.

al-Sā'idi. <sup>1</sup> When the party reached Bi'r Ma'ūna, <sup>2</sup> they sent Ḥarām b. Miḥān with the Prophet's letter to 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail. <sup>3</sup> He, however, killed the envoy, without even looking at the letter. 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail summoned his people (that is, the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a) to attack the party of the Muslims. But they respected the protection of Abū Barā', and refused to join him. He then summoned the clans of Sulaim: 'Uṣaiya, Ri'l and Dhakwān. They responded and attacked the Muslim party. The Muslims fought, but were killed to the last man. <sup>4</sup>

Two men of the expedition, 'Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī and a man from the Anṣār, who were engaged in pasturing the camels of the party, noticed some vultures hovering about the camp. When they drew near, they saw the dead bodies of their companions. The Anṣārī decided to fight, and was slain by the polytheists. 'Amr b. Umaiya was captured, but was released by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, when he stated that he was from Muḍar. <sup>5</sup> On his way, he killed two men of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, whom he accidentally met, not being aware that they had been granted protection by the Prophet. The Prophet paid their bloodwit.

Abū Barā' was grieved by the violation of his protection by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, and the death of the Prophet's companions. Ḥassān b. Thābit composed verses inciting the son of Abū Barā', Rabī'a, against 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail. <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, about him, Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, III (Beirut), 555, 618; Ibn Duraid, *Isbtīqāq*, ed. A.S. Hārūn, 456; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 275; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n<sup>o</sup> 8220.

<sup>2</sup> For the location of the place, see 'Arrām b. al-Aṣṣbagh al-Sulamī, *Asmā' Jibāl Tibāma*, ed. A. S. Hārūn, (*Nawādir al-Makḥūṭāt*) VIII, 429; Yāqūt, *Buldān*, s.v. "Bi'r Ma'ūna", "Ublā"; Samḥūdī, *Wafā' al-wafā'*, II, 256-57; Thilo, *Die Ortsnamen in altarabischen Poesie*, s.v. "Ublā".

<sup>3</sup> See *EP*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. "'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail" (W. Caskel).

<sup>4</sup> Only one man, wounded seriously, was left. He survived till the Battle of the Trench.

<sup>5</sup> Ibn al-Kalbī, *Jambara*, MS British Museum, f<sup>o</sup> 45b; al-Balādhurī, *Ansab*, MS, f<sup>o</sup> 896a.

<sup>6</sup> The rendering of these verses by Nabia Abbott (*Studies in Arabic Papyri*, [Chicago, 1957], 69) is rather inaccurate. "Alā abliḡh Rabī'ata dhā 'l-masā'ī: fa-mā aḡdathta fī 'l-ḡdathāni ba'dī" is not "Verily I shall inform Rabī'ab, he of the highest distinctions, of the event you caused to happen (right) behind me." "Alam yaru'kum" cannot be rendered: "surely you will make amends": the correct translation is: "were you not shocked (or stirred)." "Wa-mā kḡaṭ'un ka-'amdi" cannot be translated: "and he (the latter) did not do wrong (to the man of Bi'r Ma'ūna) intentionally." It should be rendered: "a mistake is not the same as an intentional act" (that is, an intentionally committed crime). Cf. the translations of Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, 435; Lyall, *The Dīwāns of 'Abīd b. al-Abraṣ*

Rabī'a b. 'Āmir, the son of Abū Barā' attacked 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, trying to kill him, but he failed.

Anas b. 'Abbās al-Sulamī, a maternal uncle of Ṭu'aima b. 'Adī b. Naufal, boasted of his killing Nāfi' b. Budail al-Khuzā'i, one of the members of the Muslim party. The martyrs were mourned in verses by 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa and Ḥassān b. Thābit. Ka'b b. Mālik composed verses blaming the Ja'far b. Kilāb (of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'sa'a) for not carrying out the obligation of protection granted to the Muslim party.<sup>1</sup>

This account of Ibn Ishāq<sup>2</sup> differs in very essential points from the account of Mūsā b. 'Uqba (d. 141 H.).<sup>3</sup> His account is traced to al-Zuhri (d. 124 H.).<sup>4</sup> Abū Barā' refused to accept Islam. He offered the Prophet a gift, but the Prophet refused to accept the gift of a polytheist.<sup>5</sup> The number of the Companions sent by the Prophet is rendered by the word *rahṭ*, denoting rather a small group.

As in the account of Ibn Ishāq, 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail summons his people to attack the Muslim party. When they refused, he appealed to the clans of Sulaim. They joined him, attacked the Muslim party and killed all the men, except 'Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī, who was released by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail.<sup>6</sup>

The same account is partly quoted by Ibn Ḥajar,<sup>7</sup> with an explicit statement that it is taken from the book of the *Maghāẓi* by Mūsā b. 'Uqba.

The most important detail in the account of Mūsā b. 'Uqba is the

and 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, 87; W. Arafat, "The Development of a Dramatic Theme in the Story of Khubaib," *BSOAS* XXI (1958), 19, line 12.

<sup>1</sup> The verses of Ka'b b. Mālik were added by Ibn Hishām; see Guillaume, *op. cit.*, 762 (678).

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Sira*, ed. Saqqā, Abyārī, Shalabī, III, 193-99; Guillaume, *op. cit.*, 433-36.

<sup>3</sup> Sachau, "Das Berliner Fragment des Mūsā b. 'Uqba," *Sitzungsberichte der phil. Classe, Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1904), 468.

<sup>4</sup> See A. A. Duri, "A Study on the Beginnings of History Writing in Islam," *BSOAS* XX (1957).

<sup>5</sup> The same saying of refusal uttered by the Prophet when 'Iyād b. Ḥimār al-Mujāshī'i offered him the gift of a horse; see Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Ma'ārif*, (Cairo, 1935), 147; al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu'jam al-ṣagbīr* (Delhi), 3; Abū 'Ubaid, *Awwāl*, 256; Ibn al-Kalbī, *Jambara*, f° 66a; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 6123. The same expression occurs again, when the Prophet refused to accept the gift of Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām; see Zubair b. Bakkār, *Nasab Quraysh*, MS Bodl., f° 65b; *Lisān al-'Arab*, s.v. "ZBD"; and see the discussion in Abū 'Ubaid's *Awwāl*, 257, whether the gift was presented by 'Āmir b. Ṭufail or by 'Āmir b. Mālik.

<sup>6</sup> See the translation of this document in Guillaume, *op. cit.*, p. xlv (Introduction).

<sup>7</sup> *Iṣāba*, n° 8220.

phrase that al-Mundhir b. 'Amr al-Sā'idī was sent by the Prophet with the group as "his spy in Najd" ('ainan lahu fī ahli Najd). It points to the fact, that the expedition was not a peaceful missionary enterprise.

The papyrus about the campaigns of Muḥammad, edited by Nabia Abbott,<sup>1</sup> contains the story of the expedition of Bi'r Ma'ūna. The date of the papyrus is fixed by Professor Abbott at the end of the second century of the Hijra and it is attributed by her to Ma'mar b. Rāshid (d. 154 H.). The story of the expedition shows close affinity to the account of Ibn Ishāq. It may be remarked that a list of the Anṣār, killed at Bi'r Ma'ūna, is given. According to the version of the papyrus, three men were pasturing the cattle of the party. One of them preferred to fight the polytheists, and was killed. The other two went back to Medina, and, on their way back, they killed the two men of Kilāb who had been granted a safeconduct by the Prophet.

The composite account of al-Wāqidi (d. 207 H.)<sup>2</sup> contains quite divergent details. According to this account, the Prophet sent seventy young men of the Anṣār, distinguished by their piety and called *al-qurrā'*. The version giving the number as seventy is told on the authority of Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī (d. 63 or 74 H.) and is repeated by a saying about four battles, in each of which seventy Anṣār were killed,<sup>3</sup> but al-Wāqidi prefers the version of forty men. Further, al-Wāqidi mentions that a guide of Sulaim, called al-Muṭālib (read: al-Muṭṭalib),<sup>4</sup> was sent with the party. Al-Wāqidi gives the name of the man of the Anṣār, who was sent with 'Amr b. Umāya to pasture the camels of the party, as al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimma.<sup>5</sup> A passage is devoted to the description of the heroic death of the leader of the party, al-Mundhir b. 'Amr; he refused to be pardoned by the attackers, fought and was killed. Also al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimma preferred to die fighting. A special passage, told on the authority of 'Urwa, reports the death of 'Urwa (b. Asmā') b. al-Ṣalt, who was on friendly terms with 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, and whom his people, the Sulaim, tried to spare and par-

<sup>1</sup> N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Papyri*, Document 5 (Chicago, 1957), 65-79.

<sup>2</sup> *al-Maghāzī*, ed. v. Kremer, 337-44.

<sup>3</sup> al-Wāqidi, *al-Maghāzī*, 338, 341; Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh*, VII (Damascus, 1932), 198; Zurqānī, *Sharḥ 'alā 'l-mawāhib*, II, 77.

<sup>4</sup> See Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 8024.

<sup>5</sup> See Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 112; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 1423. According to Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, III, 195 the name of the Anṣārī who pastured with 'Amr b. Umāya was al-Mundhir b. Muḥammad b. 'Uqba b. Uḥaiḥa b. al-Julāḥ (see, about him, Ibn Duraid, *Ishtiqāq*, ed. A.S. Hārūn, 441; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 276; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 8225).

doned. He, however, preferred to fight and was killed.<sup>1</sup> The story about the gift offered to the Prophet by Abū Barā' is recorded, but another version of this story is added as well. Abū Barā' sent Labīd and his son Rabī'a with a gift to the Prophet. The Prophet refused to accept the gift. He sent him, however, a remedy for the tumor of which Abū Barā' suffered, as he did request it. According to the account of al-Wāqidī, Rabī'a, the son of Abū Barā', attempted to kill 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail after a talk with the Prophet.

Al-Wāqidī devotes special passages to the story about the Prophet's curse on Muḍar and the clans of Sulaim,<sup>2</sup> mentions the verse of the Koran revealed to the Prophet on the occasion of the slaughter of the Companions (later abrogated) and gives a list of the killed members of the expedition.

Of special importance is a version given by al-Wāqidī, stating that Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ returned to the Prophet with 'Amr b. Umaiya. Al-Wāqidī refutes this version, on the ground that only Anṣār participated in this expedition.<sup>3</sup> Also of importance is the remark of al-Wāqidī about Anas b. 'Abbās al-Ri'li al-Sulamī, who killed Nāfi' b. Budail al-Khuzā'i: "He went out on the Day of Bi'r Ma'ūna, inciting his people to fight the Muslim party, in order to avenge the blood of the son of his sister,<sup>4</sup> Ṭu'aima b. 'Adī."

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230 H.) has two versions:<sup>5</sup> (1) a version similar to that of al-Wāqidī, including the description of the expedition as a group of pious young Readers, the action of 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail and his killing of Ḥarām b. Milhān, the curse of the Prophet, the *āya* revealed to the Prophet and the return of 'Amr b. Umaiya; (2) a tradition transmitted by Ibn Abī 'Arūba-Qatāda-Anas b. Mālik, giving quite a different explanation of the affair of Bi'r Ma'ūna. Ri'ḷ, Dhakwān, 'Uṣaiya and Liḥyān<sup>6</sup> came to the Prophet and sought his

<sup>1</sup> See, about him, Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, IV (Beirut), 377; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS f° 1131b; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb*, 491; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansāb al-'Arab*, ed. Levi-Provençal, 250; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 5509.

<sup>2</sup> See Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. A. M. Shākir, n° 7821 (Kor. 3, 128); al-Nahās, *al-Nāsikh* (Cairo, 1938), 91; Marzūqī, *Azmina*, II (Hyderabad, 1332 H.), 33; J. Kowalski, *O pewnych potrawach spozywanych w Arabii podczas głodu* (R.O. 1914), 223; al-Baghdādī, *Khizāna*, III, 142.

<sup>3</sup> Al-Wāqidī, however, contradicts himself by giving the list of the martyrs: 'Āmir b. Fuhaira was a maulā of Abū Bakr; Nāfi' b. Budail was from Khuzā'a; 'Urwa b. Asmā' b. al-Ṣalt was from Sulaim; al-Ḥakam b. Kaisān was a maulā of Makhzūm; 'Amr b. Umaiya (the survivor of the expedition) was from Kināna.

<sup>4</sup> In the text: *ibni akhībi*, read *ibni ukhtibi*; al-Maghāzī, 344.

<sup>5</sup> *Ṭabaqāt*, II (Beirut), 51-54.

<sup>6</sup> The Liḥyān were in fact cursed by the Prophet with Dhakwān, 'Uṣaiya

aid against their people (probably the unbelievers among their people). The Prophet sent with them seventy pious men of the Anṣār, called *al-qurrāʾ*. When they reached Biʾr Maʿūna, these clans betrayed them and killed them. The Prophet cursed these clans daily for a month in his morning prayer. A revelation had been sent down to the Prophet: “Inform your people, that we met our Lord and He was pleased with us and contented us.”

Two other versions recorded by Ibn Saʿd in the biography of Ḥarām b. Miḥān deserve attention. Both versions are told on the authority of Anas b. Mālik. The first version states that some people came to the Prophet and asked him to send men to teach them Koran and Sunna. The Prophet sent seventy pious men called *al-qurrāʾ*. This Muslim party was attacked by these people and slaughtered before they reached their destination. Ḥarām b. Miḥān was pierced with a spear by a man who came from behind and killed him. This version, rather a vague one, is followed by a version more clear and detailed: The Prophet sent seventy men with Ḥarām b. Miḥān to the Banū ʿĀmir b. Ṣaʿsaʿa. Ḥarām volunteered to precede the party. He came to the unbelievers and got a promise of safety. When he talked with them about the Prophet they signaled to one of them, who attacked him and pierced him with a spear.<sup>1</sup>

It may be remarked that the three versions recorded by Ibn Saʿd contradict the version that ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufail killed Ḥarām. In these three versions ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufail is not mentioned at all.

Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb (d. 245 H.) gives a very short account about the expedition. The Prophet sent al-Mundhir b. ʿAmr al-Sāʿidī with thirty men to Biʾr Maʿūna; twenty-six of them were Anṣār, four were Muhājirūn. All of them were killed, except ʿAmr b. Umaiya al-Kinānī.<sup>2</sup>

The number of the members of the expedition, given by Ibn Ḥabīb as thirty, is the smallest one mentioned in the sources. Nothing in this account is said about the course of the encounter about the aim of the expedition.

An important tradition in connection with the expedition of Biʾr

---

and Riʿl. The Liḥyān were responsible for the slaughter of the Companions at the Day of al-Rajiʿ. The information about the two disasters reached the Prophet on the same day and he cursed the clans of Sulaim together with Liḥyān; see Lyall, *The Dīwāns of ʿAbīd b. al-Abrāṣ and ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufail*, 86 n. 4; ʿAli b. Burhān al-Dīn, *Insān al-ʿUyūn*, III, 195.

<sup>1</sup> *Ṭabaqāt*, III, 514-15.

<sup>2</sup> *al-Muḥabbar*, 118.

Ma'ūna is given by Ibn Ḥabīb in a chapter devoted to "Stories of men who drank undiluted wine till death, because of anger or disdain."<sup>1</sup>

According to this tradition, it was 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail who went out against the Companions sent by the Prophet on the request of Abū Barā' to teach his people Islam, and killed them all, except one. Abū Barā' became angry, because 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail violated his promised protection of the Companions. When the people of Abū Barā' were informed that 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail had died on his way home from a visit to the Prophet, they decided to leave their abode and seek new pastures. When Abū Barā' asked about the unwonted movement in the camp he was informed: "They are departing because of the event which happened." He was surprised to learn that they were about to depart without his order. One of his relatives told him that they suspected that he had had a fit of mental aberration when he was sent to "that man." Abū Barā' became enraged and decided to drink himself to death. "There is no good in life when the Banū 'Āmir disobeyed me."<sup>2</sup>

The tribal tradition of the Banū 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a is reflected in a peculiar sentence quoted by Ibn Ḥabīb: "The Banū 'Āmir say that he did not kill himself. He died as Muslim."

The tradition recorded by Ibn Ḥabīb is a significant and a rare one, stating that Abū Barā' lost influence in his tribe and that he outlived 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail.

Al-Balādhurī (d. 279 H.) has a short record of the expedition. The number of the men was forty or seventy. They went out at the request of Abū Barā' as missionaries, and were killed in an attack launched against them by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, aided by the clans of Sulaim.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 H.) quotes the tradition of Qatāda on the authority of Anas, already mentioned above (see Ibn Sa'd), according to which the Companions were treacherously killed by the clans of Sulaim and Liḥyān who invited them. The tradition in which the role of Ḥarām b. Miḥān is stressed, already mentioned above as well, is also recorded. (See, above, Ibn Sa'd, the biography of Ḥarām.) A

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, 472; this version is given by Bakrī in his *Mu'jam mā 'sta'jam*, s.v. "Ma'ūna". The version is divergent on a detail: 'Amr b. Umaiya and Ḥarām b. Miḥān pastured the camels of the Muslims. Ḥarām decided to fight the polytheists and was killed. 'Amr b. Umaiya returned to the Prophet.

<sup>2</sup> About his drinking of wine till his death, see, Jarīr wa 'l-Farazdaq, *Naqā'id*, ed. Bevan, 199; Ibn Qutaibā, *al-Shi'r wa 'l-shu'arā'*, ed. de Goeje, 224

<sup>3</sup> *Ansāb al-ashraf*, ed. Hamidullah, I, 375.

peculiar tradition told as well on the authority of Anas deserves to be mentioned: the Prophet sent seventy men called *al-qurrā'* for some purpose. They were met by two clans of Sulaim, Ri'l and Dhakwān, at the well of Bi'r Ma'ūna. The men of the Muslim party said to them: "By God, we do not intend you, we are merely passing by to carry out some purpose of the Prophet." They (that is, the clans of Sulaim) killed the men of the Muslim party, and the Prophet cursed them daily for a month in his morning prayer.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ṭabarī (d. 310 H.) records the account of Ibn Ishāq but mentions the other versions as well. Both versions about the death of Ḥarām are given: (1) that he was killed by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, and (2) that he was killed by a man from the people of Bi'r Ma'ūna. Four verses of Ḥassān (already mentioned) and nine verses of Ka'ḅ b. Mālik, blaming the relatives of Abū Barā' for not helping the attacked Muslim party, and reproaching the violators of the promise of protection given to the Prophet, are quoted as well.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Mas'ūdī (d. 345 H.) blames 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail of the killing of seventy Anṣār sent to Najd by the Prophet, to teach the people the Koran.<sup>3</sup>

A tradition closely resembling the tradition recorded by al-Bukhārī, in which it was stressed that the missionaries did not intend the clans of Sulaim, is given by al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360 H.).<sup>4</sup> Some details in this account may be stressed: the expedition was sent by the Prophet after the death of Khubaib. It was Ḥarām b. Miḥān who informed the men of Sulaim, that the party had no intentions concerning them (*annā lasnā iyāhum nurīdu*) in order to gain their consent to their passage. There is a description of how the men of Sulaim killed Ḥarām and the Muslim party.<sup>5</sup>

An important version, differing from other accounts, is given by al-Samarqandī (d. 393 H.) in his *Tafsīr*.<sup>6</sup> The Prophet sent a troop commanded by al-Mundhir b. 'Amr. The Banū 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a went out against them, ambushed them and killed them. Three men of the participants of the expedition came back. In the neighborhood of Medina they met two men of Sulaim, who stated that they were of

<sup>1</sup> *Ṣabīh*, III (Cairo, 1286 H.), 23-25.

<sup>2</sup> Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḫ*, II (Cairo 1939), 219-223.

<sup>3</sup> *al-Tanbīh wa 'l-isbrāf* (Cairo, 1938), 212.

<sup>4</sup> *al-Mu'jam al-ṣaghīr*, 110.

<sup>5</sup> This tradition is quoted in Abū Nu'aim's *Hilyat al-auliā'*, I, 123.

<sup>6</sup> MS Chester Beatty, II, f<sup>o</sup> 228a.

‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a, and killed them. About these three men, *āya* one of sura forty-nine was revealed.

Abū Nu‘aim al-Iṣbahānī (d. 430 H.) records, in his *Hilya*, the version of Qatāda about the treacherous slaughter of the seventy Anṣār by the clans of Sulaim who invited them. He also records a tradition related on the authority of Ka‘b b. Māḥik, according to which ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail attacked and killed a small group (*nafar*) of Companions sent to the Banū Sulaim.<sup>1</sup> In his *Dalā’il al-nubūwa*, Abū Nu‘aim records the version about the sending of a small group (*raḥḥ*) of pious Companions at the request of Abū Barā’, and their slaughter by ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail. From al-Wāqidi are quoted the passages about the heroic death of ‘Āmir b. Fuhaira, and about the gift sent to the Prophet by Abū Barā’, with Labid.<sup>2</sup>

A unique tradition is recorded by Abū’l-Baqā’ Hibat Allāh.<sup>3</sup> According to this version ten survivors of the Muslim party returned to Medina.

Later sources do not contribute much to the elucidation of the event. The account of Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 686 H.) is mainly based on that of al-Wāqidi.<sup>4</sup> On Wāqidi’s account is also based the version of al-Maqrīzī (d. 845 H.).<sup>5</sup> Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 H.) records the version<sup>6</sup> given by al-Ṭabarī,<sup>7</sup> on the authority of Ishāq b. Abī Ṭalḥa—Anas: the forty or seventy Companions were sent to Bi’r Ma’ūna. There stayed ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail. The Muslims entered a cave and sent Ḥarām b. Milhān to the people of Bi’r Ma’ūna to convey the message of the Prophet. He was killed by a man of the people of Bi’r Ma’ūna. ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, with the people of Bi’r Ma’ūna, attacked the Muslims in the cave and killed them. The *āya* revealed to the Prophet in connection with this event was replaced by *āya* 169 of sura 3.<sup>8</sup>

The account of ‘Alī b. Burhān al-Dīn (d. 1044 H.)<sup>9</sup> is mainly based on the accounts of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidi. The contradictory accounts are quoted, and attempts of scholars to smooth out the con-

<sup>1</sup> *Hilyat al-auliya’*, I, 123.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 185-86 (Hyderabad, 1320 H.).

<sup>3</sup> *al-Manāqib al-Maḥyadīya*, MS British Museum f° 8a.

<sup>4</sup> *Ta’rikh*, VII, 195-199.

<sup>5</sup> *Imtā‘ al-asmā’*, ed. A. M. Shākir, I (Cairo, 1941), 170-73.

<sup>6</sup> *al-Durr al-manthūr*, II, 95.

<sup>7</sup> *Ta’rikh*, II, 222; and cf. Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. A. M. Shākir, n° 8224 (Kor. 3, 169).

<sup>8</sup> See also Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, Kor. 3, 169.

<sup>9</sup> *Insān al-‘uyūn*, III (1353 H.), 194-97.

traditions are recorded. (The number of the members of the party, the curse of Liḥyān with the clans of Sulaim, etc.)

Al-Samhūdī (d. 1056 H.) quotes the traditions of Ibn Ishāq and al-Bukhārī. Contradictory traditions are discussed (the tribal composition of the expedition, whether Abū Barā' drank wine till death, or accepted Islam and died a Muslim in battle).<sup>1</sup>

The path of reconciliation between contradictory traditions is followed by al-Zurqānī (d. 1122 H.).<sup>2</sup> A case of plausible reconciliation may be quoted here. Quoting the tradition that Ḥarām was killed by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail and the tradition that he was killed by a man of Sulaim, al-Zurqānī states that 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail was the leader of the people, so the deed was attributed to him.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, it may be said that the traditions about this expedition are contradictory as to whether the expedition was a peaceful one sent to teach Islam and the Koran, or a military enterprise; whether it was sent to the Banū 'Āmir or to Sulaim; whether the members of the expedition were slain by clans of Sulaim, by clans of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, by clans of Sulaim led by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail; whether the envoy, Ḥarām, was killed by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail; or by a man of Sulaim; whether the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a opposed the relations between Abū Barā' and the Prophet or supported it; whether ten or three or two or one of the members of the party survived and returned to Medina; whether Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās was among the members of the party or not; whether three or two men who returned to Medina killed the two men of Sulaim (or 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a), or whether it was 'Amr b. Umaiya alone who killed them; whether the members of the party were Anṣār only, or Anṣār and Muhājirūn.

## II

Scholars have tried to find an answer to the riddle of the expedition. Muir<sup>4</sup> assumes that "perhaps there were divided opinions in the tribe [that is, 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a]." Muir points out that the Prophet, almost immediately after the massacre, entered into communication with 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, on the subject of the latter's claim for blood-money for the two 'Āmirites killed by the returning 'Amr b. Umaiya, without making any counterclaim for the blood of the martyrs, and

<sup>1</sup> *Wafā' al-wafā'*, I (1326 H.), 211.

<sup>2</sup> *Sharḥ 'alā 'l-mawāhib*, II (Cairo, 1325 H.), 74-79.

<sup>3</sup> *fa-kāna nisbatu dhālika ilaihi 'alā sabīli 'l-tajawwuzi*.

<sup>4</sup> *The life of Moḥammad*, ed. Weir (Edinburgh, 1912), 280 n. 2.

remarks that (all this) "looks as if the attack was not so gratuitous as might appear."

Caetani mentions the same argument (of paying 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail the bloodwite for the two men from Kilāb who had been killed). Caetani supposes that the disaster of Bi'r Ma'ūna was the consequence of a military expedition, not of a peaceful missionary enterprise. He suggests that there might have been some violation of a pact by the Muslims, and that therefore the massacre was an act of legitimate defense or revenge.<sup>1</sup>

Lyall makes a comprehensive study of the question of the aim of the expedition.<sup>2</sup> He reaches the conclusion that it was a warlike expedition "sent by the Prophet to help one section of the Banū Sulaim against another." "The Prophet had reason to think, from his relations with Abū Barā', that the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a were friendly to him and might have been expected to help. In this he was disappointed. The Sulamīs proved to be treacherous, and 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail perhaps joined them in the attack on the Prophet's party." The payment of the bloodwit by the Prophet for the two 'Āmirites serves as evidence, for Lyall, that 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail did not in fact violate an express pledge of protection given by Abū Barā'.

Buhl gives the traditional account of the expedition as a peaceful missionary enterprise.<sup>3</sup>

Watt, trying to solve the problem of the blood money paid by the Prophet to 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, without any counterclaim for the martyrs of Bi'r Ma'ūna, declares that it is improbable, as has been suggested, "that the Muslims had done something which caused them to forfeit the right to blood money."<sup>4</sup> Watt suggests that 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail encouraged the Sulamī clans to massacre the Muslims. "He was morally responsible, he was not their leader in any sense and so not technically responsible."<sup>5</sup> "It was probably also they who killed the letter carrier." Watt suggests that the appeal of Abū Barā' to Muhammad "was at bottom an appeal for help against rivals within his tribe. Muḥammad, anxious to bring Banū 'Āmir to his own side, decided to interfere in the internal politics of the tribe,

<sup>1</sup> Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, I (Milano 1905), 578-80.

<sup>2</sup> *The Diwāns of 'Abīd b. al-Abras and 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail* (Leiden, 1913), 84-89.

<sup>3</sup> *Das Leben Muhammads* (Heidelberg, 1955), 261-62.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Caetani, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the opinion of Lyall, *op. cit.*, 89: "The Sulamīs proved to be treacherous and 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail perhaps joined them."

though he realized the riskiness of doing so.”<sup>1</sup> ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail was not strong enough to bring the tribe to disown Abū Barā’s protection, and “persuaded his neighbours of B. Sulaim to attack the Muslims, and doubtless gave them help by way of information.”<sup>2</sup>

C. E. Bosworth suggests<sup>3</sup> that “Muḥammad had apparently been invited to intervene in an internal dispute of Sulaim, but the incident is also mixed up with the quarrel within ‘Āmir between Abū Barā’ and ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail.”

W. Caskel states that “there was an engagement of protection entered into by the uncle of ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, only that ‘Āmir could not fulfil it among Sulaim, who had killed the ‘holy band’, in reality a pillaging expedition.”<sup>4</sup> Caskel states that after the death of Abū Barā’, ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail became formally the head of the Ja‘far.

Nabia Abbott assumes that “this was not a military expedition but a proselytizing mission to a large confederation of tribes in the prosperous and coveted Najd.”<sup>5</sup>

Muhammad Hamidullah mentions the massacre of the seventy missionaries, treacherously slain by ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail in the territory of Sulaim. The Sulaim were evidently discontented, assumes Hamidullah, because of the Muslim expeditions in their territory, in the preceding months.<sup>6</sup>

### III

As mentioned above, al-Wāqidī quotes a version stating that Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ returned with ‘Amr b. Umaiyā al-Ḍamrī to the Prophet, after the massacre of Bi‘r Ma‘ūna. Al-Wāqidī seems to refute this information, stressing that only men of the Anṣār participated in this expedition.<sup>7</sup>

The information about the participation of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ in the expedition of Bi‘r Ma‘ūna is included in a significant account recorded by Abu ‘l-Laith al-Samarqandī (d. 393 H.):<sup>8</sup>

‘Āmir b. Mālik, one of the horsemen of the Arabs (his nickname was Mulā‘ib al-Asinna) wrote to the Prophet: ‘Send me men to teach us the Koran and instruct us in religion. They will be under my pro-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Muir, above, about “The divided opinions in the tribe.”

<sup>2</sup> W. M. Watt, *Muhammad at Medina* (Oxford, 1956), 31-33, 97-98.

<sup>3</sup> *EI*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “Bi‘r Ma‘ūna.”

<sup>4</sup> *EI*<sup>2</sup>, s.v. “‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail.”

<sup>5</sup> *Studies in Arabic Papyri*, 76-79.

<sup>6</sup> *Le Prophète de l’Islam*, I (1959), 312.

<sup>7</sup> Wāqidī, *op. cit.*, 342 *infra*—343 *supra*.

<sup>8</sup> *Bustān al-‘arīfīn* (on margin of *Tanbih al-ghāfilīn*), 207.

tection.' The Prophet sent him Mundhir b. 'Amr al-Sā'idī with fourteen men, Muhājirūn and Anṣār. After a night's march, they heard that 'Āmir b. Mālik had died. They wrote to the Prophet and he sent four men to help them. They travelled together till they reached Bi'r Ma'una. Then they were attacked by 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail with some clans of the Bedouins, Ri'ḷ, Dhakwān, Liḥyān and 'Uṣaiya, who killed them all at Bi'r Ma'una, except for 'Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī, Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and another person. That was because they had dropped behind the party. When they [that is, the three men] learned that the party had been wiped out, they returned to Medina. The Prophet cursed these clans in his prayers for forty days.

This account, quite different from the stories of the heroic death of al-Mundhir b. 'Amr, 'Āmir b. Fuhaira, Ḥarām b. Miḥhān and others, was not admitted into the current collections of traditions about the *maghāzī*.

It seems, however, to be an abridged version. Some additional details are given in a narrative recorded by al-Samarqandī in his *Tafsīr*.<sup>1</sup>

'Āmir b. Mālik wrote to the Prophet: 'Send me men to teach us the Koran and instruct us in religion. They will be under my protection.' The Prophet sent al-Mundhir b. 'Amr al-Sā'idī with fourteen men, Muhājirūn and Anṣār and they set out in the direction of Bi'r Ma'una. When they were a night's march from Medina, they heard that 'Āmir b. Mālik had died. Al-Mundhir b. 'Amr wrote to the Prophet, asking him to send aid, and the Prophet sent four men: 'Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī, al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimma, Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and another man. They travelled till they reached Bi'r Ma'una. Then they wrote to Rabī'a b. Mālik [that is, to Rabī'a b. 'Āmir b. Mālik]: 'We are under your protection and the protection of your father. Shall we proceed to you or not?' He said: 'You are under my protection, so come.'

Then 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail set out against them and asked assistance of Ri'ḷ, Dhakwān and 'Uṣaiya. They went out against the Muslims who fought them until they killed all of them, except 'Amr b. Umaiya, al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimma and Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ.

(These three) had lagged behind (the Muslim party) and alighted under a tree. A bird perched on the tree let drop a clot of blood upon them. They understood that the bird had drunk blood, and said: 'Our friends have been killed.' They climbed a mountain and saw the dead bodies of their friends, the birds hovering over them.

Further on, a passage is devoted to the description of the heroic death of al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimma. He refused to save his own life and fought the polytheists till he was killed.

'Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī and, with him, two other men returned to the Prophet. The account contains the story of the murder of the

<sup>1</sup> MS Chester Beatty, II, 263 f.

two men of Kilāb by ‘Amr b. Umaiya, and the curse of the Prophet on Muḍar and the clans of Sulaim.

It may be remarked that whereas in the version of *Bustān al-‘Ārifīn*, al-Samarqandī states explicitly that the persons who returned to Medina were ‘Amr b. Umaiya al-Ḍamrī, Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ and a third person—he mentions, in the account of his *Tafsīr*, ‘Amr b. Umaiya, not giving the name of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ.

This account is unique in giving the number of the participants of the expedition as fourteen plus four. From among the eighteen participants fifteen were killed. It is evident that this is the account referred to and refuted by al-Wāqidi. The account states explicitly that Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ took part in the expedition, and that both the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār participated in it.

One may venture to say that we have here a very early account. It may be accepted with certainty that this version of the tradition was known and even disputed at the end of the second century.

#### IV

The assumptions put forward by the scholars, surveyed briefly above, are divergent. Some of them are contradictory. They give rise to a number of questions. One is tempted to ask, why did the Prophet decide to interfere in the internal politics of a polytheist tribe, “though he realized the riskiness of doing so,” as assumed by Watt? It is not plausible that the Prophet would have risked the lives of his Companions, if not for the cause of Islam and in the interest of the Muslim community. Further, how could ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail succeed in persuading the clans of Sulaim to attack the Muslims and kill them, as proposed by Watt, when he failed to convince his own people that they should do so? What was the relationship between ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail and the clans of Sulaim?

There is some hope of finding some of the answers and to arrive at some solutions which may elucidate the story of Bi‘r Ma‘ūna. Some details may give a clue to this.

Going through the different accounts of the story of Bi‘r Ma‘ūna one notes that, of the party of the polytheists who massacred the Muslims, only two names are mentioned in the sources: Jabbār b. Salmā b. Mālik b. Ja‘far<sup>1</sup> killed ‘Āmir b. Fuhaira.<sup>2</sup> Anas b. ‘Abbās al-

<sup>1</sup> Ibn al-Kalbī, *Jamhara*, MS f° 123a; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Isti‘āb*, 88; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 1051; Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, III, 196.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, III, 231; Ibn Duraid, *Ishtiqāq*, 25; Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*,

Ri'li killed Nāfi' b. Budail b. Warqā' al-Khuzā'i.<sup>1</sup> We are here especially concerned with the case of Anas b. 'Abbās.

Anas boasted of the killing of Nāfi' b. Budail. In one of the two verses of Anas there is mention of Abū Raiyān whose blood Anas avenged. This Abū Raiyān is said to have been Ṭu'aima b. Adī b. Naufal b. 'Abd Manāf. Anas was his maternal uncle.<sup>2</sup> Al-Wāqidī says a little more about Anas and about the role he played at Bi'r Ma'ūna. Quoting the two verses of Anas, al-Wāqidī remarks: "Anas went out on the Day of Bi'r Ma'ūna inciting his people (to attack the Muslims), in order to avenge the blood of his sister's son."<sup>3</sup>

Some details about Ṭu'aima may help to elucidate the course of events.

Ṭu'aima b. 'Adī b. Naufal b. 'Abd Manāf b. Quṣaiy belonged to the nobility of Quraish in Mecca.<sup>4</sup> His boon companion was one of the noble quraishites of Mecca, Munabbih b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Sahmī.<sup>5</sup> Like Munabbih, Ṭu'aima was a fierce opponent of the Prophet.<sup>6</sup> According to one of the traditions, the document about the boycott of the Banū Hāshim was entrusted to Ṭu'aima.<sup>7</sup> He attended the meeting at the Dār al-Nadwa at which the problem of the expulsion of the Prophet was discussed, representing the Banū Naufal.<sup>8</sup> He incited the Quraish to fight on the eve of the battle of Badr,<sup>9</sup> and was one of the *muṭ'imūn* during the march.<sup>10</sup> He is said to have killed, at Badr, Sa'd b. Khaithama<sup>11</sup> and Sahl b. al-Baiḍā'.<sup>12</sup> According to a tradition of al-Wāqidī, he killed Ṣafwān b. al-Baiḍā'.<sup>13</sup> Traditions are not unanimous about his death: whether he was captured at Badr and the Prophet ordered Ḥamza to kill him in cold blood,<sup>14</sup> or whe-

n<sup>o</sup> 4408; Sakhāwī, *al-Tuḥfa al-laṭīfa*, ed. As'ad Darabzūnī (Cairo, 1957-8), n<sup>o</sup> 1908.

<sup>1</sup> See Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n<sup>o</sup> 8644.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, III, 197-98.

<sup>3</sup> Wāqidī, *op. cit.*, 344.

<sup>4</sup> Mu'arrij, *al-Ḥadīf min nasab Quraysh*, 42.

<sup>5</sup> Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, ed. Lichtenstadter, 177.

<sup>6</sup> al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS, f<sup>o</sup> 808b; *idem*, *Ansāb al-asbrāf*, ed. Hamidullah, I, 153-54.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 235.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, II, 125.

<sup>9</sup> al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-asbrāf*, I, 292.

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, II, 320.

<sup>11</sup> al-Balādhurī, *op. cit.*, I, 296.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 225; but see Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, IV, 213.

<sup>13</sup> *al-Maghāzī*, 141; but see Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, III, 416.

<sup>14</sup> Ibn Qutaiba, *Ma'ārif*, 68: "Three were killed in cold blood at Badr: 'Uqba, Ṭu'aima and al-Naḍr"; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS, f<sup>o</sup> 808b; *idem*, *Ansāb al-asbrāf*, ed. Hamidullah, I, 148; Ibn Ḥazm *Jawāmi' al-sīra*, 148.

ther he was killed in an encounter with 'Alī and Ḥamza. Some sources record a vivid description of this encounter. Al-Wāqidi gives this description,<sup>1</sup> but omits the name of Ṭu'aima. The story is quoted by Muṣ'ab al-Zubairi,<sup>2</sup> by Abū 'l-Baqā' Hibat Allāh<sup>3</sup> and by al-Majlisī.<sup>4</sup> Some sources mention only that he was killed at Badr.<sup>5</sup>

The clan of Naufal b. 'Abd Manāf were opposed to the Hāshim b. 'Abd Manāf and Muṭṭalib b. 'Abd Manāf, and were allies of the 'Abd Shams b. 'Abd Manāf.<sup>6</sup> 'Adī b. Naufal competed with 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib in supplying beverages for the pilgrims: al-Muṭṭalib supplied the beverages at Zamzam, 'Adī b. Naufal, at a spot between al-Ṣafā and al-Marwa; the latter offered them honey and milk.<sup>7</sup> The mother of 'Adī was Hind, Umm al-Khiyār bint Wuhaib, of Māzin the kindred of Sulaim.

The mother of his sons, Muṭ'im and Ṭu'aima, was Fākhita bint 'Abbās b. 'Āmir b. Ḥuyayī b. Ri'ī, of Sulaim.<sup>8</sup> Of special importance is the information stating that the Sulaim were allies of the Banū Naufal.<sup>9</sup>

It is thus conceivable why the clans of Sulaim responded, according to some accounts, when 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail summoned them to attack the Muslim party. The reasons are clearly expounded in a significant passage of the *Nasab Quraysh*:<sup>10</sup>

The Banū Ri'ī and Dhakwān, and they are allies of the Banū Naufal (and they are of Sulaim), gave aid to 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail against the Companions of the Prophet, who were killed at Bi'r Ma'ūna, because of Ṭu'aima.<sup>11</sup> He who aided 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail was Anas b. 'Abbās al-Ri'ī, called al-Aṣamm. With him went out (to the attack) the Ri'ī, Dhakwān and 'Uṣaiya. The 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a refused to aid

<sup>1</sup> *Maghāzī*, 87.

<sup>2</sup> *Nasab Quraysh*, 199-200.

<sup>3</sup> *al-Manāqib al-Maẓyadīya*, MS, f° 8a.

<sup>4</sup> *Biḥār al-anwār*, VI "Bāb ghaẓwat Badr al-kubrā" (quoted from al-Wāqidi).

<sup>5</sup> Mu'arrij, *al-Ḥadhf min nasab Quraysh*, 42; Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, II, 366; Muḥammad b. Ḥabib, *Muḥabbar*, 177.

<sup>6</sup> Mu'arrij, *al-Ḥadhf min nasab Quraysh*, p. 41; al-Balādhuri, *Ansāb*, MS, f° 808a: "Za'amū anna Banī Naufal b. 'Abd Manāf kānū yadan ma'a 'Abd Shams 'alā sā'iri Banī 'Abd Manāf."

<sup>7</sup> Muṣ'ab, *Nasab Quraysh*, 32, 197 (cf. the expression "Ibn al-Siqāyatin").

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 198; al-Sam'āni, *Ansāb*, f° 255a.

<sup>9</sup> Muṣ'ab, *op. cit.*, 97, 198.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 198-199.

<sup>11</sup> Jubair b. Muṭ'im b. 'Adī promised to free his slave Wahshī, if he would kill Ḥamza (Ḥamza, as mentioned, killed Ṭu'aima). Wahshī succeeded, in fact, in killing Ḥamza at Uḥud and was freed by Jubair. (See Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, III, 65, 76.)

‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, because Abū Barā’ was the protector of the Companions who were killed by ‘Āmir b. al-Ṭufail at Bi’r Ma’ūna.

We shall now follow the thread of Anas b. ‘Abbās who seems to have been the driving spirit behind the attack on the Muslim party.

W. Arafat, in his penetrating study of the story of Khubaib, analyses a verse of Ḥassān in which the name Anas is mentioned, and says: “Anas, according to Ibn Hishām and the note to the poem in the *Dīwān*, was from the tribe of Sulaim and nothing else seems to be known about him.”<sup>1</sup> Every bit of information about Anas may be helpful to elucidate the case of Bi’r Ma’ūna.

The name Anas is glossed by Ibn Hishām as follows: “Anas al-Aṣamm al-Sulamī, the maternal uncle of Muṭ‘im b. ‘Adī b. Naufal b. ‘Abd Manāf.”<sup>2</sup> He can thus easily be identified with the chief of the clan of Ri‘l, Anas b. ‘Abbās b. ‘Āmir b. Ḥuyaiy b. Ri‘l b. Mālik b. ‘Auf b. Imra’al-Qais b. Buhtha b. Sulaim, as mentioned in Muṣ‘ab’s *Nasab*.<sup>3</sup> His sister was Fākhita bint ‘Abbās, the wife of ‘Adī, the mother of Ṭu‘aima b. ‘Adī, whose blood Anas avenged at Bi’r Ma’ūna. His father, ‘Abbās, known as ‘Abbās b. Raiṭa, was a highly respected chief of his people, and the Sulaim intended to “put a crown on his head.” ‘Abbās had as antagonist one of his relatives, who offended him, and he left his tribe. He joined the Fazāra.<sup>4</sup> According to al-Jāhiz, he was compelled to leave his tribe because of the small number of his kin in the tribe.<sup>5</sup> ‘Abbās was a poet,<sup>6</sup> but his verses were sometimes attributed to his son Anas,<sup>7</sup> who was also a poet.<sup>8</sup>

Anas b. ‘Abbās, according to Ibn al-Kalbī,<sup>9</sup> al-Balādhuri<sup>10</sup> and Ibn Ḥazm,<sup>11</sup> was a chief of his people, and was killed by the

<sup>1</sup> W. C. Arafat, “A Dramatic Theme in the Story of Khubaib b. ‘Adiy,” *BSOAS* XXI (1958), 26.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Hishām, *Sira*, III, 188.

<sup>3</sup> Page 198; the same genealogy is recorded in al-Zubair b. Bakkār’s *Nasab Quraysh*, MS Bodl., f° 191a (in the genealogy of “Zainab bint ‘Adī b. Naufal”).

<sup>4</sup> *Aghānī*, XVI, 55 (his name is given as “al-‘Abbās b. Anas,” but see al-Jāhiz, *Ḥayawān*, quoted below); Nallino, *Raccolta*, III, 66.

<sup>5</sup> *al-Ḥayawān*, I, 359; V, 30, 31.

<sup>6</sup> al-Bakrī, *Simt*, 513; Jarīr wa ‘l-Farazdaq, *Naqā’id*, ed. Bevan, 392.

<sup>7</sup> al-Marzubānī, *Mu‘jam*, ed. Krenkow, 263; Yāqūt, *Buldān*, s.v. “Dafīna.”

<sup>8</sup> Sibawaihi, *Kitāb*, I (Būlāq, 1316 H.), 349; Abū Tammām, *al-Waḥshīyāt* (ed. Maimani), 231.

<sup>9</sup> *Jambara*, MS, f° 160a.

<sup>10</sup> *al-Ansāb*, MS, f° 1132a.

<sup>11</sup> *Jambarat ansāb al-‘Arab*, 250 (erroneously “Ibn Jubair b. Ri‘l” instead of “Ibn Ḥuyaiy”).

Khath'am.<sup>1</sup> A story told on the authority of Abū 'Ubaida states that Anas raided, together with Ṣakhr b. 'Amr al-Sulamī, the Banū Asad.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Sa'd mentions that Anas was a member of the delegation of Sulaim who visited the Prophet. He is said to have embraced Islam.<sup>3</sup>

Of special importance for the elucidation of the relations between Ri'ḷ and 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, and especially between Anas and the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, is the story of *Yaum al-Raghām* reported by Abū 'Ubaida. When the Tha'laba b. Yarbū' attacked the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, Anas b. 'Abbās stayed with the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a. He acted in the interest of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, trying by a stratagem to make possible a counterattack of the Kilāb against the Tha'laba b. Yarbū'. He was captured and released after paying a ransom of 200 camels.<sup>4</sup> The place of the encounter between the Yarbū' and the Kilāb seems to have been al-Zilāl. Yāqūt mentions that as the place, stating that it belonged to the Ja'far b. Kilāb. "They (that is, the Ja'far b. Kilāb) were attacked at this spot by 'Utaiba b. al-Ḥārith b. Shihāb. He seized their cattle and the cattle of the men of Sulaim."<sup>5</sup> The *Naqā'id* have an additional phrase, which is of some importance:<sup>6</sup> "...of the men of Sulaim, being under their protection. One of them was Anas b. 'Abbās al-Ri'ḷi." This phrase supplies a clue for the understanding of the relations between the clan of Ri'ḷ and the Ja'far of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, and throws light on the action of 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail.

## V

It is not easy to establish the true facts about the expedition. In the light of the version recorded by al-Samarqandī, which was omitted

<sup>1</sup> The information of Ibn al-Kalbī is quoted in Ibn Ḥajar's *Iṣāba*, n° 269.

<sup>2</sup> *Aghānī*, XIII, 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Ṭabaqāt*, I, 307 (erroneously "Anas b. 'Iyād al-Ri'ḷi"); this information is also recorded in Ibn 'Asākir's *Ta'rīkh*, III, 137, and in Ibn Ḥajar's *Iṣāba*, n° 269. About the son of Anas, Razīn, see Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 2645. About his father, 'Abbās, see Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 4496 (al-'Abbās b. Anas b. 'Āmir al-Ri'ḷi) and al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS, f° 1138b ('Abbās b. Anas al-Aṣamm).

<sup>4</sup> Jarir wa'l-Farardāq, *Naqā'id*, ed. Bevan, 410; *Aghānī*, XIV, 84; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS, f° 997b f. Other versions about the capture of Anas by 'Utaiba b. al-Ḥārith: (1) Anas came to 'Utaiba as a guest and was treacherously put in fetters, and released after he paid a ransom; (2) he was under the protection of 'Utaiba and was treacherously tied, put in fetters, and released after paying ransom; see al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, MS, f° 997b and f° 1138b ("Anas b. 'Iyād" and "Anas b. Mirdās," in the MS, are errors).

<sup>5</sup> So Yāqūt, *Buldān*, s.v. "Zilāl"; *amwāla 'l-muslimīna*, in the *Naqā'id*, 302, is an error; read: "*amwāla 'l-sulamīyīna*". <sup>6</sup> *Naqā'id*, 302.

in the traditional accounts, and after a closer study of the data quoted above, some suggestions about this expedition may be propounded.

Abū Barā', one of the leaders of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a came into touch with the Prophet. He was an aged man and was summoned by the Prophet to accept Islam. Neither he nor his son Rabī'a<sup>1</sup> embraced Islam, although the tribal tradition of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a tried to show that Abū Barā' later embraced Islam, fought and fell in battle. According to the traditions, he agreed to give the Muslim group safe conduct and consented to the propagation of Islam in his tribe. That is quite plausible, and Abū Barā' might have hoped that he would strengthen his influence in the tribe by accepting the Muslim group. A significant phrase in Ibn Qutaiba's *al-Shi'r wa' l-shu'arā'* seems to point to this fact.<sup>2</sup> The Prophet obviously hoped to win over parts of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a to the cause of Islam. The action brings to mind the despatch of missionaries to Medina before the Hijra. After the defeat at Uḥud, it was the only way of propagating Islam.

The Prophet sent a group of fourteen Companions, relying upon the promise of Abū Barā'. The Companions might have realized on their way that they were only a few, and sent to ask for aid. They received the aid of four men. Two of the four were famous for their valor: Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ was an excellent fighter; 'Amr b. Umaiyā was a reckless warrior, although the Prophet's opinion on his moral qualities was rather unfavorable.<sup>3</sup> It is also plausible to assume that the Muslim troop sent word to Rabī'a, the son of the aged Abū Barā', asking him to reaffirm the promise of safe conduct and protection. They wanted to be sure that he would stand by his father's pledge. Whether Abū Barā' died exactly on the night when the Companions set out is rather doubtful. The tradition that he lived a short time after the massacre of Bi'r Ma'ūna seems to be more trustworthy.

The Muslim troop alighted at Bi'r Ma'ūna. Here evidently the clans of Sulaim led by Anas b. 'Abbās al-Ri'li camped under the protection of the Kilāb. Groups of Kilāb stayed there also. This is indicated by the fact that 'Āmir b. Fuhaira was killed by Jabbār b. Salmā of the Banū Ja'far of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a. The expedition took place in a

<sup>1</sup> See, about him, Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, n° 2627.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Shi'r wa' l-shu'arā'*, ed. de Goeje, 224, var. "q": *li-yuqārrūhu 'alā riyāsatibi*. In the edition of Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā (Cairo, 1932) it is rendered: *li-yuqātilūhu 'alā riyāsatibi*. In the edition of Shākir (Cairo, 1364 H.) the phrase has been omitted.

<sup>3</sup> See Abū Dā'ūd, *Sunan*, II, 296, "Bāb fī 'l-ḥidhr."

very hot month (Safar/July-August, 4 H.), and the clans evidently gathered with their herds around the well. The envoy of the Muslim troop came to the people staying at the well and informed them that they were not the object of their expedition. The envoy, Ḥarām b. Miḥān, was killed by one of the people.

The attack was a sudden one, as attested by a verse of the sister of al-Mundhir b. 'Amr.<sup>1</sup>

The attack was led by Anas b. 'Abbās al-Ri'ī. He fulfilled his obligation as a relative of Ṭu'aima b. 'Adī to avenge his death at Badr. The clans who followed him fulfilled their obligation as allies of the Banū Naufal.<sup>2</sup> Some units or individuals of Ja'far b. Kilāb might have taken part in the attack. This is indicated by a verse of the sister of al-Mundhir b. 'Amr, in which she mentions "the wolves of the Ḥijāz, the Banū Buhtha [that is, the Banū Sulaim] and Banū Ja'far" [that is, Ja'far b. Kilāb of the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a].<sup>3</sup> 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail might have approved the action of Anas or even taken part in the attack. But the responsibility was on the Ri'ī and the other clans of Sulaim. It was the Ri'ī and clans of Sulaim who were cursed by the Prophet. The action is connected with Mecca and the Naufal b. 'Abd Manaf were the cause for the launching of the attack on their enemies. The attack was apparently inspired by Mecca.

In fact, the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a are merely reproached for not standing by the pledge of protection. Ka'b b. Mālik reproaches the 'Āmir that they did not come to the aid of those attacked when they asked for help. They refrained from coming to their aid, because they knew that the battle would be a serious one.<sup>4</sup> 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail is reproached by Ḥassān for violation of the pledge of Abū Barā', obviously because he did not prevent the clans of Sulaim, his clients, to attack the Muslim troop.<sup>5</sup>

It is conceivable that Abū Barā' was grieved by the violation of

<sup>1</sup> "Had the group been wary of these troops," Ḥassān, *Diwān*, ed. Hirschfeld, 57.

<sup>2</sup> The case of al-Rajī' is also connected with the clan of Naufal b. 'Abd Manāf: Khubaib was killed in revenge for al-Ḥārith b. 'Āmir b. Naufal. Khubaib was bought by Ḥujair b. Abī Ihāb, an ally of the Banū Naufal. He was executed by the son of al-Ḥārith with the assistance of Abū Maisara of the 'Abd al-Dār. See Ibn Hishām, *Sira*, III, 182.

<sup>3</sup> Ḥassān, *Diwān*, ed. Hirschfeld, 57-58.

<sup>4</sup> Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, II, 221-22.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ibn Hishām, *Sira*, III, 198: "You left your 'jār' (that is, the Muslim group) to the Banū Sulaim, fearing their hostile action, in (your) abjection and weakness."

his protection. According to the record of Ibn Qutaiba,<sup>1</sup> he commanded his people to kill 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, but they disobeyed. The affair had evidently, in their opinion nothing to do with them. It was the Banū Sulaim who had settled their accounts with the Muslims. They, the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, considered the sending of Abū Barā' to "that man" as a fit of mental aberration.<sup>2</sup> It was only the son of Abū Barā' who tried to kill 'Āmir b. al-Ṭufail, but failed. Abū Barā', feeling that he had lost authority in his tribe, started to imbibe undiluted wine and drank himself to death. It may be remarked that the verses of Ḥassān are addressed to Abū Barā's son, Rabī'a; not one verse is addressed to Abū Barā'. He lost influence in his tribe, and must have died shortly after the massacre of Bi'r Ma'una, probably from his tumor.

The tradition about the attendance of Sa'd b. Abi Waqqāṣ was not admitted into the traditional accounts, because of the case of the murder of the two men of Kilāb (or Sulaim) granted safe conduct by the Prophet. The report of Qatāda, as quoted by al-Samarqandī,<sup>3</sup> states explicitly that the two men were killed by the three Companions, returning from Bi'r Ma'una. The report of the papyrus states that the two returning Companions killed the two men of Kilāb.<sup>4</sup> Later collections of the *maghāzī* preferred not to mention the version claiming that Sa'd b. Abi Waqqāṣ, the first who shed blood for the cause of Islam, the hero of al-Qādisiya, did not take part in the battle of Bi'r Ma'una but saved his own life, while the other Companions died the death of martyrs, or was involved in the murder of the two men of Kilāb. The blame of the murder of the two men of Kilāb was put solely on 'Amr b. Umāiya al-Ḍamrī.

The Prophet could not demand the bloodwite for the martyrs from the Banū Sulaim, nor from the 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a. He promised to pay the bloodwite for the two men of Kilāb, killed by his Companion (or Companions) and started to collect the money of the indemnity. He summoned the Banū Naḍīr to contribute a portion of it. That led to the encounter with the Naḍīr and to their expulsion.

<sup>1</sup> *al-Shi'r wa 'l-shu'arā'*, ed. de Goeje, 224.

<sup>2</sup> Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 472.

<sup>3</sup> MS Chester Beatty, I, 228a.

<sup>4</sup> Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Papyri*, Document 5 (verso), 69, lines 11-12.