

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

By MARTIN HINDS

I. THE BACKGROUND

Stage 1

In the first half of Ṣafar 37/late July–early August 657, there took place some important developments in the war between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya which brought to an end the prolonged confrontation at Ṣiffin. After a series of duels, skirmishes and small-scale engagements, followed by a lull in hostilities in Muḥarram 37, there was a resumption of fighting in Ṣafar which culminated in the most serious engagement of the confrontation. There were signs of rapid escalation and it became clear that, if the fighting were to continue, the total forces of the two sides would probably soon be engaged. As the battle progressed – and this is reported by both Iraqi and Syro-Medinan authorities – the Syrians became fearful that they were losing,¹ and it was at this point that Mu‘āwiya and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ exploited the divisions which existed within the ranks of the coalition which ‘Alī had attempted to form.² They cannot have been unaware that ‘Alī’s following included many groups which preferred not to fight but might nevertheless be drawn into the battle if it continued.³ We may note particularly that al-Ash‘ath b. Qays al-Kindī, who did not take part in the battle, is reported by al-Sha‘bī publicly to have expressed fears of attack from the Persians and Byzantines if these two Arab armies cut each other to pieces; on being informed of this, Mu‘āwiya is reported to have regarded it as representative of the opinion of *dhawī al-ahlām wa’l-nubā* and to have ordered the attaching of *maṣāḥif* to

¹ Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-asbrāf*, 2 vols., MS Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Reisülkuttap Mustafa Efendi), nos. 597, 598 (hereafter BA/MS), I, 378, 381; al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa’l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje *et alii*, three series (Leiden, 1879–1901) (hereafter Tab.), I, 3329.

² These divisions are discussed in “Kūfan political alignments and their background in the mid-seventh century A.D.”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, II (1971), 361 ff. (hereafter “Kūfan political alignments”).

³ For an example of earlier Syrian awareness of the divisions within ‘Alī’s following, see Tab. I, 3257.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

spearheads.¹ According to al-Zuhri, however, it was 'Amr b. 'Aṣ who suggested this, when he advised Mu'āwiya *mur rajul^{an} fal-yanshur al-muṣṣaf thumma yaqūl: yā ahl al-'Irāq baynanā wa-baynakum kitāb allāh, nad'ukum ilā mā bayna fāṭihātibi wa-khātimatibi*; he went on to point out that this would cause disagreement among 'Alī's followers and increase the obedience of Mu'āwiya's own followers.² Mu'āwiya thereupon caused a *muṣṣaf*, or a number of *maṣāḥif*, to be raised up on the points of spears, and his followers called out *hādihā kitāb allāh baynanā wa-baynakum, man li-thughūr al-Shām ba'da ahl al-Shām wa-man li-thughūr al-'Irāq ba'da ahl al-'Irāq?*³

Whether it was Mu'āwiya or 'Amr who instigated this is of no great importance here.⁴ What is important is that this call was addressed neither to 'Alī, nor to 'Alī's following as a whole, but to the Iraqis, who made up most but not all of his following. The Syrians were clearly attempting to isolate 'Alī from his Iraqi followers. By referring to the *thughūr* of Syria and Iraq, they were echoing the sentiments of al-Ash'ath and appealing to regional interests. Mu'āwiya's declared minimum requirement was Syrian autonomy under his own leadership, and this had never changed; it was in defence of that requirement that he had succeeded in mobilizing the support of the Syrians, who swore allegiance to him not as *amīr al-mu'minīn* but as *amīr* to fight 'Alī,⁵ i.e. in so far as 'Alī posed a threat to Syrian autonomy. If 'Alī had been prepared to leave Mu'āwiya in Syria and to refrain from interfering in Syrian affairs, and if Mu'āwiya had really been prepared to settle for no more than a free hand in Syria, the Syrians would very probably have been ready to swear allegiance to 'Alī as *amīr al-mu'minīn*. But these conditions did not obtain and the confrontation at Ṣiffin was threatening to turn into a resolution of their differences by force of arms. What Mu'āwiya was aiming to achieve at the time of the raising

¹ Naṣr b. Muṣāḥim al-Minqarī, *Waq'at Ṣiffin*, ed. A. M. Hārūn, 2nd edn. (Cairo 1382/1962-3) (hereafter WS), pp. 480-1.

² BA/MS I, 379-80.

³ BA/MS I, 378; Tab. I, 3329. Other references to this incident are: BA/MS, pp. 380, 381; Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī, *Kitāb al-futūḥ*, I-IV (Hyderabad, 1388/1968-1391/1971) (hereafter A'th.), III, 306; Khalifa b. Khayyāt, *Tārikh*, I, ed. A. D. al-'Umarī (al-Najaf 1386/1967) (hereafter Khal.), p. 176.

⁴ Petersen, *'Alī and Mu'āwiya in early Arabic tradition* (Copenhagen, 1964) makes much of this distinction.

⁵ BA/MS I, 372, 379. See also Tab. I, 3233, 3249, where 'Amr's oath is *'alā 'l-khilāf* and *'alā muḥārabat 'Alī*.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

of the *maṣāḥif* was to isolate 'Alī from his Iraqi followers by putting the conflict in a different light, as a senseless conflict between Iraqis and Syrians – senseless because the two parties had similar types of regional interests.

Notwithstanding the fact that it is what was said at the time of the raising of the *maṣāḥif* that is of particular importance, a few words about the *maṣāḥif* themselves will not be out of place, if only because of the way in which this act of raising them on spears has appealed to the imagination of later commentators. What, first of all, are we to understand by the word *muṣḥaf* in this context? While most reports, including all the Iraqi ones, say that the *maṣāḥif* were raised on spears, the report of al-Zuhri says that Mu'āwiya followed 'Amr's advice *mur rajul^{an} fal-yanshur al-muṣḥaf*. . . by instructing a Syrian called Ibn Lahya to this effect, i.e. to display a single *muṣḥaf*.¹ Šāliḥ b. Kaysān also refers to Ibn Lahya when he reports that, when it was said that Mu'āwiya's side was being defeated, Ibn Lahya came with a *muṣḥaf*, and with him others bearing *maṣāḥif*, saying *baynanā wa-baynakum mā fihā*.² Neither of these traditions mentions spears and neither indicates large numbers of *maṣāḥif*. There are therefore grounds for caution regarding reports which imply that great numbers of *maṣāḥif* were raised, including *muṣḥaf Dimashq al-a'ẓam* which allegedly required ten men to hold it aloft on spear-points.³ This is particularly the case if we understand *muṣḥaf* to mean a complete version of the Qur'ān, for not only is it hard to believe that more than a few complete versions were available but it is also difficult to visualize the impalement or other form of attachment of such versions to the points of spears. It is therefore noteworthy that other references in the Arabic sources to *maṣāḥif* show that they could be worn on the neck. Ṭabarī mentions two Jews in pre-Islamic Yemen who had *muṣḥafs* on their necks⁴ and Ibn al-Kalbī, when referring to the death at the battle of the Camel of the *qāḍī* and former Christian, Ka'b b. Sūr, remarks that on his neck there was a *muṣḥaf*.⁵ These two items of information suggest that certain amulets may have been called *maṣāḥif* and this is in accord with our knowledge that there was among the Jews of the time a widespread use of amulets, which were worn on the arm or neck and consisted of parchment bearing the name of God or

¹ BA/MS I, 380.

² *Ibid.* p. 381.

³ WS, p. 481.

⁴ Tab. I, 905 (*maṣāḥifubumā 'alā a'nāqihimā*).

⁵ BA/MS I, 352 – but cf. the next paragraph of this article.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

scriptural passages.¹ Although there is no evidence that the use of similar amulets was a common practice among Muslims at the time of Šiffin, it is nevertheless possible that the display of *al-muṣḥaf*, i.e. a complete version of the Qur'ān, provoked a further display of *maṣāḥif*, which may have been pieces of parchment inscribed with words from the Qur'ān and used as amulets.

In order to understand why a *muṣḥaf* or *maṣāḥif* should have been displayed or raised at all in this connexion, it is necessary to take note of two precedents at the battle of the Camel. The first of these took place immediately before the battle when 'Alī ordered a follower of his to raise *al-muṣḥaf*^a or *muṣḥaf*ⁿ between the two opposing lines. Apparently he hoped by this means to avoid the onset of fighting, although this came to nothing when the man was shot dead and fighting ensued.² Secondly, Ka'b b. Sūr is variously reported to have raised *al-muṣḥaf*, *kitāb allāh* and *muṣḥaf 'Ā'isha* during the battle of the Camel, in the hope of stopping the fighting, and to have been killed while so occupied.³ The absence of information about any established procedure prior to the battle of the Camel for calling for a halt in hostilities suggests that one did not exist in previous methods of Arab warfare, in which one small group had fought another until it was either victorious or took to flight. It was only with the advent of Islam that Arabs formed armies of thousands and at first these Muslim armies fought only non-Muslim armies and did not to our knowledge follow any particular method for calling an end to hostilities. The battle of the Camel was the first major confrontation of Muslims on opposing sides and marked the first occasion when such a procedure was needed. That the battle of the Camel was the first occasion when a *muṣḥaf* was raised for the purpose is confirmed by 'Alī's reaction to the raising of *maṣāḥif* at Šiffin, when he said *balaghabum mā fa'altu min raf' al-muṣḥaf li-abl al-Jamal, fa-fa'alū mithlabu, fa-lam yurīdu mā aradt*.⁴ From this it may be concluded that, whatever else may have been implicit in the action, an ostensible reason for the raising of *maṣāḥif* by the Syrians was that, in the absence of any other procedure for bringing about the cessation of hostilities, this recently tried method could be used again; *rufi'at al-maṣāḥif wa-da'aw ilā 'l-sulh* says Khalifa.⁵

¹ *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, 12 vols. (New York, 1901-6), art. "Amulet".

² Tab. I, 3186, 3189; BA/MS I, 353; A'th. II, 315.

³ Tab. I, 3171, 3191, 3211.

⁴ BA/MS I, 378.

⁵ Khal. p. 176.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

This call for peace and appeal to the interests of the Iraqis sufficed to cause an immediate split within 'Alī's following, with only a minority, including 'Alī himself, being in favour of continued fighting. This minority was the hard core of 'Alī's supporters, both Hijāzīs and Iraqīs, who had much to fear from Mu'āwiya, depended upon 'Alī, and sought to strengthen themselves by strengthening him. An attempt has already been made to show how the Kūfan part of this support (*shī'a*) was led by certain Islamic old guard leaders, notably Mālik al-Ashtar b. al-Ḥārith al-Nakha'ī, whose waning influence had been restored by 'Alī.¹ The rest of the Iraqīs, however, favoured settlement, but for differing reasons. On the one hand, the established clan leaders had gone with 'Alī to Ṣiffīn because they wanted to assure their positions and interests, not because they were prepared to be killed fighting the Syrians, and so wanted any excuse for peace; we may note, for example, the attitude of the leaders of various sections of Rabī'a, whose mouthings of their intention to support 'Alī in whatever course he might take were interspersed with obvious hints at their reluctance to fight and their preference for a reconciliation.² The most powerful of the clan leaders, al-Ash'ath, whose interest lay in ensuring that neither 'Alī nor Mu'āwiya gained a clear advantage, was more outspoken; he insisted upon settlement and is reported to have told 'Alī that not a single Yemeni would fight for him if he did not accept the proposal.³ On the other hand, the majority of the *qurrā'* "who afterwards became Khawārij", who were Islamic old guard standing apart from the clan structure, while favouring a settlement, expected a settlement of a particular kind.⁴ In considering the position taken by them, it is important to notice that all that had so far happened had been a show of *maṣāḥif* and a call for the application of *kitāb allāh*. There was as yet no indication that 'Alī would not be regarded as *amīr al-mu'minīn* by all or that there would be established the type of arbitration agreement which was in fact subsequently arranged. What mattered to the *qurrā'* was that there had been a call for the application of the *kitāb allāh*, which they regarded as the main function of the *amīr al-mu'minīn*, and they made it clear to 'Alī

¹ "Kūfan political alignments", pp. 361 ff.

² WS, pp. 484-8. Rabī'a were *al-jabha al-'uzmā* on 'Alī's side.

³ A'th. III, 307; WS, p. 484; BA/MS I, 383 (. . . al-Sha'bī - "the most opposed to those who wanted to fight were al-Ash'ath and *abl al-Yaman*").

⁴ On this and what follows, see "Kūfan political alignments", pp. 363-4.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

that they would not countenance his rejection of such a proposal.¹ From their point of view, there was no need for continued fighting. 'Alī had come from Medina to Iraq to deal with Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr and when he had finished with them he had turned his attention to Mu'āwiya. He had shown that he intended his stay at Kūfa to be temporary and so had given the impression that, once he had dealt with Mu'āwiya, he would return to Medina, since he would have no further need of Kūfa as a base. The *qurrā'* had at first been hesitant about siding with 'Alī, but most of them had gone to Ṣiffīn and taken part in the fighting because they wanted to give 'Alī sufficient backing to reach a settlement. When the Syrians began to lose, raised the *maṣāḥif* and made their announcement, most of the *qurrā'* saw no need for continued fighting. In their view all that remained was the matter of drawing up a formal peace with Mu'āwiya; 'Alī would be recognized as *amīr al-mu'minīn* by both Syrians and Iraqis, return to Medina, confine himself to the application of *kitāb allāh* and leave the people of Iraq and Syria to look after their own affairs.

Stage 2

Such was the number of his followers who insisted that fighting should be halted and that efforts be made to reach a settlement with the Syrians, that 'Alī, having agreed to their demand that he prevent al-Ashtar from continuing the fight, sent al-Ash'ath to ascertain exactly what Mu'āwiya proposed. Mu'āwiya told him that he had raised the *maṣāḥif* "so that you may send a man and we may send a man, to be *ḥakams*; we shall do whatever they agree upon";² a more detailed version reads "you and we shall return to what God has enjoined in his book; you will send from your side a man with whom you are satisfied and we shall send a man from our side. We shall then require them (*na'kbudh 'alayhimā*) to act by what is in the book of God, not opposing it, then we shall follow whatever they agree upon".³

No more than this appears to have been said. There is no evidence that Mu'āwiya made any specific reference at this point to the subject of the arbitration; in spite of his earlier harping on the blood of 'Uthmān and the need for a return to *shūrā*, he was now silent on these matters, and al-Ash'ath clearly

¹ A'th. III, 312; WS, pp. 429-30; Tab. I, 3330.

² BA/MS I, 378.

³ Tab. I, 3333. For other accounts, see WS, pp. 498-9; A'th. III, 324-5; BA/MS I, 380.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

had no interest in forcing the issue. When he returned with news of Mu'āwiya's words, and their implication that two arbiters should arrive at some sort of settlement, most of those who were with 'Alī expressed their satisfaction with that.¹ 'Alī, who had by this time with some difficulty restrained al-Ashtar from fighting, could only acquiesce further and turned to the appointment of the *hakam* who would meet with 'Amr b. al-Āṣ, now named as Syrian *hakam*. On this question there immediately appeared a fundamental split about whether the *hakam* was to be 'Alī's representative or the representative of the Iraqis, predominantly Kufans. His own nominations, first of 'Abdallāh b. 'Abbās and then of al-Ashtar, were swept aside both by al-Ash'ath and by the leaders of the *qurrā'* "who afterwards became Khawārij", who jointly insisted that only Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī was acceptable "because he warned us against that into which we have fallen". 'Alī told them that he could not be satisfied with Abū Mūsā, who had earlier prevented people from joining him and who, having fled, had only recently been granted safe-conduct by him.²

Once again, 'Alī could only acquiesce. As the agent of the *modus vivendi* achieved at Kūfa in 34/654-5,³ Abū Mūsā was attractive to many Kūfans as the Iraqi representative. The move of al-Aḥnaf b. Qays to put himself forward as *hakam*, which could be seen at least in part as an attempt to assert the Baṣran minority in 'Alī's predominantly Kūfan army, came to nothing.⁴ In spite of the diversity of their aims, both al-Ash'ath and the *qurrā'* agreed on the need to make Abū Mūsā the *hakam*. The *qurrā'* chose Abū Mūsā because he had stood for provincial autonomy, non-involvement in outside squabbles and a fair deal for the representatives of the old order. al-Ash'ath joined them in insisting upon Abū Mūsā because by so doing he ensured the prolonging of the deadlock between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya and put a check on 'Alī's power of action; in this way he sought to regain his former measure of independence and influence. For the rest of the Kufans, the details of who should be *hakam* were probably of little interest. They owed no special allegiance to 'Alī but were prepared to give him formal support if he was in a

¹ BA/MS I, 383 (*fa-kāna 'uzmubum wa-jumbūrubum muqirrin bi'l-tahkīm rādīn bihi*). See also WS, p. 499.

² Tab. I, 3333-4; WS, pp. 499-500; A'th. IV, 1-3; BA/MS I, 381 (which says that al-Ash'ath *wa-jamī' al-qurrā'* insisted upon Abū Mūsā).

³ See "Kūfan political alignments", pp. 360-1.

⁴ Tab. I, 3334; WS, p. 501; BA/MS I, 360; A'th. IV, 5-6.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

position of strength. They saw no benefit in fighting the Syrians, however, and welcomed Mu'āwiya's proposal as a means of arriving at a peaceful settlement.

The dilemma of 'Alī and the collapse of his coalition were completed with the drawing up of a document, referred to in the sources variously as *kitāb al-qāḍiyya*, *kitāb al-ṣulḥ*, or simply *al-wathīqa*. Even before this was drawn up, however, it appears that the anomalies of the situation were becoming evident to some of 'Alī's followers, for there is mention of a group of *qurrā'* who now came out in favour of continuing the fight; 'Alī could only point out to them that the majority favoured settlement and they then separated from him.¹ The drafting of the document proceeded only after 'Alī had agreed to be referred to by name and not as *amīr al-mu'minīn*. The sources relate that Mu'āwiya, or 'Amr, objected to the insertion of the title on the ground that if he were indeed *amīr al-mu'minīn*, as he asserted, Mu'āwiya would not have fought him; 'Alī, under pressure from al-Ash'ath and, so we are told, bearing in mind the Prophetic precedent at Ḥudaybiyya, allowed the erasure.² It is difficult not to be suspicious of the coincidence of Mu'āwiya demanding that 'Alī erase the title *amīr al-mu'minīn* and of his father Abū Sufyān earlier having demanded that the Prophet erase the title *rasūl allāh*. Nevertheless, every transmission of the document omits the title and 'Alī is universally understood to have consented to this omission.

The document itself, which is the subject of close study in the second part of this article, occurs in two distinct versions, one of which is an elaboration of the other. It has already been suggested that the more elaborate version (Version B) should be regarded as spurious,³ and a detailed attempt will be made to justify this assessment below. In broad terms, both versions say that the *kitāb allāh* is to be between the two sides; that (although the subject of the arbitration is not clearly specified) it is the task of the arbiters to reach some sort of decision, which is to be binding; that in reaching this decision they should be guided by *kitāb allāh*; that, when they fail to find guidance there, they should resort to *al-sunna al-'ādila al-jāmi'a gḥayr al-mufarriqa* (Version A) or *summat rasūl allāh al-jāmi'a* (Version B). After the making of various provisions, such as the procedure to be fol-

¹ WS, p. 497; BA/MS I, 383-4 (numbers them at 4,000).

² Tab. I, 3335; WS, p. 506; A'th. IV, 8.

³ "Kūfan political alignments", p. 364 n. 2.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

lowed in the event of the death of one of the arbiters, the text of the document concludes with stipulations relating to the time and place of the meeting of the arbiters. The names of witnesses from both sides (many more names in the case of Version B) are appended to the document.

The question of the type of *sunna* to which recourse could be had is central both to arriving at an explanation of the reaction to the document of those “who afterwards became Khawārij” and to determining the significance of the difference between the two versions. The two issues are of course intertwined, but we shall leave the details of the second until the next section and here concentrate on the first. The most detailed account of the reaction to the document is given in *Waq‘at Šiffīn* by Shaqīq b. Salama, who describes how a great cry of *la ḥukmā illā lillāh* went up among many of the Iraqis after the document had been drawn up. Shaqīq says that these “Khawārij” told ‘Alī that if he did not repent of his acceptance of the arbitration, as they had done, they would declare their quittance (*barā‘a*) of him; when ‘Alī said that he would not, they were true to their word.¹ What they had in fact realized was that the document meant that, contrary to their expectation, ‘Alī would not be going back to Medina as an *amīr al-mu‘minīn* who was recognized by both Syrians and Iraqis, who would confine himself to applying the prescriptions of *kitāb allāh* and who would, accordingly, be the sort of *amīr al-mu‘minīn* they wanted; as Shaqīq b. Salama points out, they had expected that he would be “named as *amīr al-mu‘minīn* by all, until the book may confirm him (or: set him apart) in his place”.² Instead of this ‘Alī had become party to an agreement in which he was not recognized as *amīr al-mu‘minīn*. Even more serious was that the same agreement (if we follow Version A) extended the authority of the arbiters beyond the *kitāb allāh* to the application of the vague *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a gbayr al-mufarriqa*. What was this? Its presence in the text shows that the following of *kitāb allāh* was not thought likely to provide any basis for a solution. It carries with it no specification of whose *sunna* is meant; indeed it could mean any *sunna jāmi‘a*. As noted elsewhere,³ the phrase *ḥilf jāmi‘ gbayr mufarriq* occurs in connexion with pre-Islamic alliances. The phrase compromised the authority of *kitāb allāh* and was under-

¹ WS, pp. 513–14.

² WS, p. 517; and see “Kūfan political alignments”, p. 364 n. 5.

³ “Kūfan political alignments”, p. 366 n. 2.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

stood as *taḥkīm al-rijāl fī dīn|kitāb allāh*. Shaqīq shows that the “Khawārij” were unequivocally opposed to this, when he relates that they said “As for ‘what they do not find in the Book (sc. the words in the document), let *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a gḥayr al-mufarriqa* [be applied]’, they have not been sent to judge by other than the Book”;¹ and again “And concerning [the provision in the document] ‘If they come to something about which they know no *qur‘ān*, let *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a gḥayr al-mufarriqa* [be applied]’, neither one of the sides is permitted to leave the Book and the [Prophet’s(?)] *sunna* . . .”.² In short, version A provides us with a curious phrase, the explanation of which in turn accounts for the sudden “Khārijī” reaction and accusations of *taḥkīm al-rijāl fī kitāb allāh*. It was a phrase loaded with meaning in terms of clan organization and control, and this cut to the heart of the interests of the *qurrā’*. Version B of the document, which refers only to *sunnat rasūl allāh al-jāmi‘a* and the like, could never have evoked such a reaction from them.

By this stage, fuel had also been added to the fire by the Syrian claim that the document was an agreement that the Qur‘ān should be consulted on the question of the legality of the killing of ‘Uthmān.³ Here too was a ground for rejection of the document by the *qurrā’*, for they had no doubts that ‘Uthmān had been justly killed. Mention of ‘Uthmān by the Syrians at such a late but critical point in the proceedings needs to be noticed in conjunction with their earlier evasiveness on the subject. The whole affair bears every sign of having been a skilfully organized divisive manœuvre, which successfully wrecked ‘Alī’s coalition. The purpose of the arbitration agreement had been served even before the opposing parties left Ṣiffīn. The arbitration itself was a farce best summed up by Khalīfa in one sentence “the arbiters agreed on nothing”.⁴

II. THE DOCUMENT

While it could be argued on the grounds of the above interpretation alone that Version A of the document is preferable to Version B, it is possible to present other cogent reasons, connected principally with the provenance of the reports and the names of the witnesses, in order to justify this assessment. This section therefore deals with provenance, contrasts the two ver-

¹ WS, p. 515.² WS, p. 516.³ Shaqīq in WS, p. 515 (*in aḥalla ‘l-kitāb damabu bari‘nā minbu wa-mimman tawallāhu wa-man yaṭlubu damabu . . . wa-in kāna kitāb allāh yamna‘ damabu . . .*).⁴ Khal. p. 176.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

sions (paying particular attention to *summa* passages) and examines the lists of witnesses; some relevant observations by al-Jāhiz are discussed; and various conclusions to be drawn from the two versions are summarized. The texts of the two versions and a comparison of the four renderings of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Version A are given at the end of the section.

Provenance

It is a striking point that our two most important sources for early Islamic history, the *Tārīkh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk* of al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)¹ and the *Ansāb al-asbrāf* of al-Balādhurī (d. 279/892)² give only Version A in their accounts of the Ṣiffin confrontation. The same is true of Ibn A'tham (fl. 204/819) (although in an abbreviated rendering) in his important *Kitāb al-futūḥ*,³ of al-Jāhiz (d. 255/869) (although not without reservations on his part to which it will be necessary to return) in his *Risāla fi'l-ḥakamayn wa-taṣwīb amīr al-mu'minīn 'Alī*,⁴ and of Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) (again in an abbreviated rendering) in his (if it is his) *al-Imāma wa'l-siyāsa*.⁵ The abbreviation of the document given by al-Ya'qūbī (d. 284/897) avoids the issue and could be from either version.⁶ Among the early sources, only the *Waq'at Ṣiffin* of Naṣr b. Muzāḥim al-Minqarī (d. 212/827), gives both versions;⁷ the later author of *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha*, Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd (d. c. 655/1257), repeats them both, evidently having taken them from al-Minqarī.⁸ al-Dīnawarī (d. c. 282/895), in his *al-Akbbār al-ṭiwāl*, is alone among early Islamic historical writers in giving only Version B.⁹

A wide range of authorities is cited in connexion with Version A. Al-Ṭabarī's rendering is given on the authority of Abū Mikhnaḥ, Al-Balādhurī's on the authority of all his sources (*qālū*),

¹ I, 3336-7.

² I, 382.

³ IV, 14-15; the authorities are given at II, 344-5. For an examination of Ibn A'tham's dates see M. A. Shaban, *The 'Abbāsīd Revolution* (Cambridge, 1970), p. xviii.

⁴ Ed. C. Pellat in *al-Mashriq*, 52^e année (1958), pp. 417-91 (hereafter *al-Hakamayn*), pp. 451-2.

⁵ (Cairo 1388/1969), I, 132-3.

⁶ Ed. M. T. Houtsma, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1883), II, 221.

⁷ WS, pp. 504-11.

⁸ Ed. M. A. Ibrahīm, 20 vols., 2nd edn. (Cairo, 1385/1965-1387/1967), II, 132-3.

⁹ Ed. W. Guirgass (Leiden, 1888), pp. 207-10.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

Ibn A'tham's on the authority of one or more (he does not identify which) of the well-known narrators listed by him at the beginning of his account of the Şiffin confrontation, and that of al-Jāhiz on the authority of al-Zuhrī and Muḥammad b. Ishāq. In the *Waq'at Şiffin* of al-Minqarī, Version A is given "on the authority of 'Umar b. Sa'd [b. Abī'l-Şayd al-Asadī] (d. c. 180/796),¹ who said: Abū Ishāq al-Shaybānī (i.e. Sulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān, d. 141 or 142)² related to me saying: I read the peace document (*kitāb al-ṣulḥ*) apud Sa'id b. Abī Burda [b. Abī Musā al-Ash'arī]³ on a yellow sheet upon which were two seals, one at the bottom and one at the top; upon the seal of 'Alī, may peace be upon him, [was inscribed] 'Muḥammad is the Messenger of God' and upon the seal of Mu'āwiya [was inscribed] 'Muḥammad is the Messenger of God'".⁴

Al-Dīnawarī does not cite his authorities, so that the provenance of his rendering of Version B is unknown. Al-Minqarī helps to remedy this deficiency, however, by reporting Version B, "on the authority of 'Amr b. Shamir [al-Ju'fī al-Kūfī] (d. c. 160/776)⁵ on the authority of Yazīd al-Ju'fī (d. c. 128/746)⁶ on the authority of Zayd b. Ḥasan [b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib(?)].⁷ 'Amr said: Jābir said: I heard Zayd b. Ḥasan mention the document of the two arbiters (*kitāb al-ḥakamayn*); he augmented it with something more than was mentioned by Muḥammad b. 'Alī [(Zayn al-'Ābidīn) b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī] (d. 114/732)⁸ and⁹ ['Āmir b. Sharāḥīl] al-Sha'bī (d. 104/722-3)¹⁰ in the abundance of witnesses and in the augmentation and decrement of words (*ḥurūf*); he dictated it to me from a document (*kitāb*) he had with him, and said. . .".¹¹ The *isnād* given by Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd is briefer but amounts to the same thing: "Naşr [b. Muzāḥim al-Minqarī] said: This is the narration (*riwāya*) of Muḥammad b.

¹ F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1967), 311.

² Al-Bukhārī, *Kitāb al-tārīkh al-kabīr*, 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1360/1941-1378/1959), II, no. 1808.

³ *Ibid.* II, no. 1527.

⁴ WS, p. 509; also Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha*, II, 233.

⁵ Sezgin, *op. cit.* p. 310.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 307.

⁷ Al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.* II, no. 1305; Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī, *Mashābir 'ulamā' al-amṣār*, ed. M. Fleischhammer, Bibliotheca Islamica, xxII (Cairo, 1959), no. 424.

⁸ Al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.* I, no. 564; Ibn Ḥibbān, *op. cit.* no. 420.

⁹ This "and" is omitted by Hārūn's editions but is given in the earlier Cairo edition (*Maṭba'at al-'Abbāsiyya* 1340/1921, p. 367) and in the *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha* (see below).

¹⁰ Al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.* II, no. 2961. ¹¹ WS, p. 504.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn and al-Sha‘bī; Jābir, on the authority of Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan (?) related augmentations on (‘*alā*) this copy . . .”¹

In the case of Version B, then, we are dealing with an elaborated version associated with a transmission chain of decidedly pro-‘Alid colouring and explicitly stated to have been subject to tampering. It can also be noted here that Zayd b. Ḥasan and Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, in reports transmitted by al-Minqarī on their authority, give the preposterously high figure of 150,000 for the number of Iraqis who went with ‘Alī to Ṣiffīn.² The provenance of Version B therefore contrasts in a striking manner with that of A, where a number of renderings, given on the authority of different narrators, tally closely; not only that, but al-Minqarī’s final authority for Version A claims to have read an original copy of the document in the possession of the grandson of none other than Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī. Yet neither of the two modern scholars who have devoted most space to ‘Alī and Ṣiffīn has attempted to indicate the significance of these two versions. L. Veccia Vaglieri merely makes passing reference to the existence of two texts.³ Petersen, for whom this should have been a matter of crucial importance, since he studies ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya from an historiographical point of view, not only fails to indicate the significant differences between the versions but also reads al-Sha‘bī in the *isnād* of Version A where the text quite plainly says Abū Ishāq al-Shaybānī; since the role of al-Sha‘bī is central to his argument, the effect is disastrous.⁴

Contrast of the two versions

The extent to which the two versions are distinct from one another in wording is self-evident. Beyond this, the most obvious point of contrast between them is the discrepancy in length; excluding the lists of witnesses, Version A is just less than 300 words long, while Version B is almost 500 words long, the greatest discrepancy being in the second part of the document, which has here been marked as the fourth paragraph. In this part, too, there are variations in the order in which items

¹ *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha*, II, 234.

² WS, p. 156. Other estimates are in the area of 50,000 and even they are suspiciously high.

³ “Il conflitto ‘Alī-Mu‘āwiya e la secessione khārigita riesaminati alla luce di fonti ibāditi” in *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*, N.S. IV (1952), 26.

⁴ *‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya in early Arabic tradition*, pp. 41–2.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

occur. Version A follows the order: cessation of hostilities declared, guarantees of safety, injunction that arbiters are to decide justly (var. make peace), period of time involved, arrangements in event of death of arbiter, specification of meeting place of arbiters, reference to witnesses to the document, decision not to be guided by "other than what God revealed". The fourth paragraph of Version B, on the other hand, goes as follows: arrangements in the event of death of an arbiter, arrangements in the event of death of 'Alī or Mu'āwiya (*al-amīrayn*), cessation of hostilities declared, injunction that arbiters are to decide justly, guarantees of safety, specification of meeting place of arbiters, period of time involved, judgement to be by "the book of God and the *sunna* of His Prophet". It is in the first part, however, in paragraph 2, that the essential difference between the two versions occurs, viz. when Version A reads *al-sunna al-'ādila al-jāmi'a gbayr al-mufarriqa* and Version B reads *summat rasūl allāh al-jāmi'a*. To make the point quite clear, Version B again refers, once in para. 3 and twice in para. 4, to judgement according to *kitāb allāh wa-summat rasūlibi|nabiyyibi*; these references are not paralleled in Version A, which refers to *sunna* only in para. 2. It can be seen, moreover, from the following comparison of the four renderings of Version A for paras. 2 and 3, where they differ from each other most, that they all agree upon *al-sunna al-'ādila al-jāmi'a gbayr al-mufarriqa*. That the four renderings diverge on other points of wording but agree upon this phrase constitutes a telling comment upon its importance and probable historical validity; if this is so, Version B must be regarded with suspicion.

Such a contention is further supported by examination of the lists of witnesses appended to the document. Version A, it can be seen, gives the names of only ten witnesses from each side, while Version B gives twenty-nine from 'Alī's side and thirty-two from Mu'āwiya's side; the rendering of Version B given by Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd, which omits the names of witnesses, says that there were ten witnesses from each side, but this is probably as a result of inadvertent confusion with Version A. The principal touchstone in these lists is the name of al-Ashtar Mālik b. al-Ḥārith. The absence of his name from the list of witnesses in Version A is explained by several authorities when they report his blunt refusal to be party to the document by witnessing it.¹ As already indicated, he had much to fear from a settlement with Mu'āwiya and much to gain from an all-out victory by 'Alī. The

¹ Tab. I, 3338, 3344; BA/MS I, 383; WS, p. 511.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

absence of the name of Ḥujr b. ‘Adī al-Kindī from the list given by Version A can be explained in the same way.¹ In Version B, however, both of these names appear in the expanded lists, and the reason which suggests itself is that the authorities for this version could not bring themselves to relate that a document to which ‘Alī himself agreed was not at that stage agreed to by all who were with him, including two of his main supporters; al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn are (inevitably) included, together with other respectable Islamic names,² and the list of witnesses from Mu‘āwiya’s side is expanded correspondingly. It will be recalled that a direct reference to tampering is made in the *isnād* given by al-Minqarī. By the same token, it seems that these authorities altered *al-summa al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a ghayr al-mufarriqa* to *sunnat rasūl allāh al-jāmi‘a* and so removed from the text of the document the main feature which makes “Khārijī” opposition to ‘Alī at that particular time comprehensible.

Version B, then, is spurious; it was evidently transmitted before c. 128/746 (the date of the death of Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju‘fī) and probably after 114/732, when both al-Sha‘bī and Muḥammad b. ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn were dead. The cause of its appearance at this particular time must remain an open question, but it is noteworthy that the unsuccessful revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī Zayn al-

¹ On Ḥujr, see “Kūfan political alignments”, pp. 347–8, 362. Note that Ṭabarī’s rendering of Version A reads Ḥujr b. ‘Adī instead of Ḥujr b. Yazīd.

² In the case of the following witnesses given in Version B, there is direct evidence that they cannot have played the role attributed to them: (a) al-Ḥusayn and (b) al-Ṭufayl, the sons of al-Ḥārith b. al-Muṭṭalib (nos. 5 and 6), are reported to have died during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān (see W. Caskel, *Ḡamharat an-nasab; das genealogische Werk des Hišām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1966), II, 336, 558); (c) Mālik b. Rabī‘a al-Anṣārī (no. 7) probably died long before Ṣiffin (see *ibid.* p. 393); (d) Khabbāb b. al-Aratt (no. 8) is reported to have died at Kūfa after ‘Alī had left for Ṣiffin (Tab. I, 3347); (e) ‘Uqba b. ‘Āmir al-Juhānī (no. 14) was at Ṣiffin on Mu‘āwiya’s side and is reported to have been one of the killers of ‘Ammār b. Yāsir (Tab. III, 2317); hence he can hardly have been one of the witnesses from ‘Alī’s side. The Anṣārī ‘Uqba b. ‘Āmir, who fought at Badr, was killed fighting against Musaylima (Caskel, *op. cit.* II, 573); (f) Rāfi‘ b. Khadij al-Anṣārī (no. 15), who was one of the *ṣaḥāba*, is named as one of the few Anṣār who did not support ‘Alī (Tab. I, 3070).

The first four of the above-named possessed the merit of having fought on the Prophet’s side at Badr; so did Abū’l-Yasār Ka‘b b. ‘Amr al-Anṣārī (no. 10) and Rifā‘a b. Rāfi‘ b. Mālik al-Anṣārī (no. 11) (see Caskel, *op. cit.* II, 362, 487), who were alive at the time of Ṣiffin, although there is no other evidence to show that they were present there.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

‘Ābidīn took place at Kūfa in 122/740, and the version may have emerged from the activity which preceded that revolt. The question which poses itself here, however, is whether, if Version B is spurious, Version A is therefore genuine. The evidence cited above suggests to this writer at least that Version A is substantially genuine, although we can scarcely hope to reconstruct the exact wording. The rendering given by al-Minqarī should commend itself particularly, however, since not only is *Waq‘at Ṣiffīn* the oldest complete work available to us in which a rendering is given *in extenso*, but also the *isnād* indicates that the authority saw ‘Alī’s copy of the document.¹ Furthermore, our faith in al-Minqarī’s impartiality should be fortified by his presentation also of Version B, accompanied by an ample caveat within the *isnād*.

Al-Jāhīz and Version A

Al-Jāhīz, however, who gives us a rendering of Version A on the authority of al-Zuhrī and Ibn Ishāq, manifestly holds a view different from the above when he says that the document (or, more specifically, this particular rendering of it) is *kitāb madkbūl*.² Whether he means by this that it is totally concocted or merely contains interpolations, he does not make entirely clear. What does emerge quite clearly from his treatise, however, is that the line of his argument compels him to minimize the importance of the document and to undermine its credibility, as we shall see below. He accordingly emphasizes the following points:

- (i) that the document contains wording which is foolish (*sakbīf*), insignificant (*khafīf*) defective (*da‘īf*) and incorrect (*rakīk*);
- (ii) that “what also makes it ambiguous is the disagreement of the Khawārij and the Shī‘a and, what (i.e. the difference) there is between the people of Syria and the people of Iraq by way of augmentations (*ḥawā’id*) and decrement (*nuḥṣān*) concerning it”;
- (iii) that its *isnāds* are defective and that even those most reliable of the *akbbāriyyīn*, al-Zuhrī and Ibn Ishāq, did not themselves see it;
- (iv) that in the case of most of the witnesses mentioned (i.e. nine of the ten from ‘Alī’s side), their *nishas* are in doubt and their names disputed.³

¹ According to al-Ya‘qūbī, *Tārīkh*, II, 220, the copy from ‘Alī (i.e. for Mu‘āwiya) was written by ‘Alī’s scribe ‘Abdallāh b. Rāfi‘ and the copy from Mu‘āwiya (i.e. for ‘Alī) was written by Mu‘āwiya’s scribe ‘Umayr b. ‘Abbād al-Kinānī. See the final sentences of the two versions.

² *al-Ḥakamayn*, p. 452, §78.

³ *Ibid.* p. 453, §§78–9.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

Al-Jāḥiẓ does not state specifically which parts of the document he regards as being subject to the first of these charges, but it is evident from the next stage of his argument, to which we shall return, that he means the references to *sunna*. As for his second point, it has been argued above that the disagreement of the Khawārij and Shī'a *can* be explained; unfortunately we have no Syrian version of the document (only a common Iraqi and Medinan version) which would permit further examination of the second part of this point. On the third point, it cannot be said that the *isnāds* for Version A of the document are any more defective than those for other reports concerning the same period; and here, as in other cases where several reports of the same event exist, the essential items of information can be seen to have been preserved. Further on this point, while al-Zuhrī and Ibn Ishāq do not claim to have seen the document, their rendering is substantially confirmed by that of Abū Ishāq al-Shaybānī, who does claim to have seen it. As for the fourth point, there is much less confusion among the names of the witnesses than al-Jāḥiẓ is trying to suggest, and it is understandable that the names of Iraqis should be more subject to error in the Medinan rendering he transmits than in the other renderings available to us, which are transmitted by Iraqis. The same can be said of the *nisbas*, but it should also be noticed that these are not given by Abū Ishāq al-Shaybānī, and it may be concluded from this that the leaders who acted as witnesses to the document were referred to only by their own names and those of their fathers, reference to the *nisbas* being unnecessary, and that later transmitters took it upon themselves to add the *nisbas*.

Returning to the first of the above points, it becomes perfectly clear that al-Jāḥiẓ cares to understand the reference to *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a ghayr al-mufarriqa* as a reference to the *sunna* of the Prophet. He poses the questions *ayna tilka’l-sunna? wa-ayna tuṭlab? wa-min ayyi shakl^{im} hiya? wa-mā lafẓubā? wa-mā aṣl mā’nāhā?* and he comes back with the answer that *al-sunna allatī qaṣadū ilayhā hiya ‘llatī fī ṣubufinā mim mā faraḍa ‘llāh wa-sunnat al-nabī ṣl^m fī ummatibi*. They describe the *sunna*, he says, as *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a ghayr al-mufarriqa*, and adds *wa’l-sunan kulluhā ‘ādila wa-kulluhā jāmi‘a ghayr mufarriqa*; the corruption of the whole affair, he goes on, is demonstrated by the absence of any evidence that reference was subsequently made to the Qur’ān or the *sunna*.¹

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 454–5, §§80–3.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

In order to put all this in some perspective, however, it is necessary to take a broader look at the lines of argument being pursued by al-Jāhiz. The treatise is written as a response to certain views expressed by one Ibn Ḥassān, about whom nothing is known but whose views, in so far as they can be determined by what al-Jāhiz says, appear to the present writer to have contained some perspicacious historical analysis. Al-Jāhiz, as may be inferred from the phrase *taṣwīb*... 'Alī in the title of the treatise, is concerned with arguing the rightness of 'Alī's actions. Throughout the treatise he insists upon treating 'Alī and Mu'āwiya separately, the basis of his argument being the rightness of action given by God to his prophets and caliphs.¹ In describing his approach, he says that he will not judge an action to be an error until all efforts to prove its rightness have failed, and that even if an action must be judged an error, it is to be regarded as of the most venial type until it is necessary to judge otherwise. He declares that he will judge only in the light of clear proof.²

With these principles in mind, al-Jāhiz presents an interpretation of 'Alī's actions which is certainly original and in some respects contains important insights, but is for the most part in conflict with the sources. He rightly emphasizes more than once the lack of cohesion within 'Alī's coalition, draws attention to the authority of tribal leaders within Mu'āwiya's army and notes the success with which Mu'āwiya bought loyalty.³ He appreciates that a small united army is stronger than a large disunited army.⁴ He recognizes the raising of the *maṣāḥif* as a stratagem on the part of Mu'āwiya, but it is here that his argument takes a novel turn, for he maintains that 'Alī hoist Mu'āwiya with his own petard (*a'mala 'l-makīda 'inda 'l-ḥāja ilā 'l-makīda*), by taking advantage of the respite which would follow in order to unify his followers;⁵ for, while Mu'āwiya despaired of winning, victory was at the same time snatched from 'Alī because of the divisions within his following.⁶ Al-Jāhiz leaves us in the dark as to what he imagines Mu'āwiya's stratagem to have been, and confesses his amazement that Mu'āwiya should have been satisfied with a truce when he saw how divided 'Alī's ranks were.⁷ He rejects the view that 'Alī was compelled to accept the nomination of

¹ *Ibid.* p. 458, ll. 2-4.² *Ibid.* pp. 460-1, §§95-6.³ *Ibid.* pp. 426-30, §§22 ff.⁴ *Ibid.* p. 438, §51.⁵ *Ibid.* p. 443, §60; p. 453, §79.⁶ *Ibid.* p. 440, end of §54 and beginning of §55.⁷ *Ibid.* p. 445, §63.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

Abū Mūsā as arbiter; rather, it was in accord with his plan, for it would be easier for him to reject, if necessary, the judgement of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ and Abū Mūsā than that of worthier men.¹ The document is therefore of no importance according to this interpretation save as a time-gaining device on the part of ‘Alī, and al-Jāḥiẓ accordingly seeks out grounds for undermining its credibility. Some pages before giving the text of the document, he is careful to stress that ‘Alī was a man who acted in accord with *al-kitāb wa’l-sunna*.² In this way, he prepares the reader for his view that the phrase *al-sunna al-‘ādila al-jāmi‘a ghayr al-mufarriqa* is unnecessary embroidery for the “Prophet’s sunna” and, as such, amounts to a ground for regarding the document as *maddkhūl*.

Al-Jāḥiẓ, it is clear, was following his penchant for arguing a case and chose to ignore much information which is available to us and was no doubt available to him. He draws no attention to the widespread fear of full-scale engagement which prevailed from the beginning of the Ṣiffīn confrontation and accounted for the length of its duration.³ He keeps clear of both the nature of the stratagem Mu‘āwiya had in mind at the time of the raising of the *maṣābiḥ* and the pressures upon ‘Alī from within his following. In particular, he is hard pressed to find any justification at all for his assertion that ‘Alī freely chose Abū Mūsā as arbiter. Above all, he is led by his argument that ‘Alī was still master of the situation to regard the document as he reports it (i.e. Version A) to be concocted. As indicated above, most of this is in conflict with the sources, and Version A of the document should be regarded as substantially correct.

It remains only to note that one particular phrase in the Zuhri/Ibn Ishāq rendering of Version A given by al-Jāḥiẓ attracts attention; this is the phrase in para. 3 *la-yarḍayāni* (sc. ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya) *bimā yaqḍayāni* (sc. the arbiters) *fihimā min khal‘i man khalā‘ā wa-ta’mir‘i man ammarā*. Al-Jāḥiẓ himself draws no special attention to this and the other renderings do not include it; it must therefore remain an open question whether this slightly clearer specification of the function of the arbiters, with its obvious inference in the direction of the *imārat al-mu’mīnīn*,

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 443–5, §§35–40; pp. 455–7, §§85–6.

² *Ibid.* pp. 445–6, §§65–7.

³ Abū Mikhnaḥ, for example, mentions that after the first engagement at Ṣiffīn there was a widespread abhorrence of the prospect of full-scale battle *li-mā yatakhawwafūna fī dhālika min al-isti’sāl wa’l-balāka* (Tab. I, 3272).

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

was included in the original document or not. Even if it was, it makes no difference to the remarks made above, for 'Alī had already acquiesced in the erasure of the title of *amīr al-mu'minīn* and it is reported that to 'Alī himself Mu'āwiya had already suggested *an yahkum^a baynanā wa-baynaka* (n.b. singular) *hakamān radiyyān. . . bi-kitāb allāh*.¹

Conclusions

The evidence, both internal and circumstantial, therefore leads to the conclusion that Version A is substantially genuine, while Version B is spurious. An attempt has been made above to show the relevance of this to our understanding of the agreement itself. The central issue of *summa* to which recourse was to be had must of course be connected with the development of the meaning of the word *summa* from the broader "way of proceeding" and "generally agreed practice" in pre-Islamic and earliest Islamic times to the later and narrower meaning of "precedents set by the Prophet". In a chapter entitled "*Summa*, 'Practice' and 'Living Tradition'", Schacht has shown this development in some detail, and his conclusions certainly argue against the authenticity of Version B.²

Leaving the question of *summa*, two further final points can be made. Firstly, comparison of the different renderings of Version A illustrates clearly the way in which the various transmission chains responsible for the preservation of our source material on early Islamic history frequently agree on particular kernels of fact, while differing on points of detail. A hypercritical approach, more concerned with areas of disagreement and with dismissing authorities on the grounds of error in detail than with explaining areas of agreement, necessarily prevents access by its exponents to the wider perspectives contained in the materials.

The second point follows from the preceding and concerns Version B. If this represents an early stage in the elaboration of the Shī'ī tradition, as seems to be the case, we may well ask how it is that authorities such as Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/774), who is generally noted for his pro-Shī'ī sympathies, does not transmit it; the Shī'ī al-Minqarī, we have noticed, gives both versions, but with ample warning in the *isnād* of Version B; even al-Ya'qūbī does not commit himself to Version B – this is done

¹ WS, p. 493.

² *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 3rd impression (Oxford, 1959), pp. 58 ff.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

only by al-Dīnawarī. It is evident from this that any sweeping judgements about the invalidity of reports transmitted by Shī'īs or supposed Shī'īs are out of place. The establishment of realistic criteria for the appreciation of early sources for Islamic history is a subject which is still in its infancy.

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

THE TEXTS

Version B

Version A

<p>هذا ما تقاضى عليه علي بن أبي طالب ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان وشيعتهما فيما تراضيا به من الحكم بكتاب الله وسنة نبيه⁽¹⁾ قضية علي على أهل العراق[×] ومن كان من شيعته من شاهد أو غائب⁽²⁾ [وقضية معاوية على أهل الشام ومن كان من شيعته من شاهد أو غائب]⁽³⁾ أنا⁽⁴⁾ رضينا⁽⁵⁾ أن ننزل⁽⁶⁾ عند حكم القرآن فيما حكم⁽⁷⁾ وأن نقف عند أمره فيما أمر وأنه لا يجمع بيننا إلا ذلك وأنا جعلنا[×] كتاب الله فيما بيننا حكما⁽⁸⁾ فيما اختلفنا فيه⁽⁸⁾ من فاتحته إلى خاتمته نحى ما أحيا ونميت ما أمات⁽¹⁰⁾</p>	§1	<p>هذا ما تقاضى عليه علي بن أبي طالب ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان قاضى علي بن أبي طالب⁽¹⁾ على أهل العراق⁽²⁾ ومن كان⁽³⁾ معه⁽⁴⁾ من شيعته⁽⁵⁾ من المؤمنين والمسلمين وقاضى معاوية بن أبي سفيان⁽⁶⁾ على أهل الشام ومن كان معه⁽⁷⁾ من شيعته⁽⁸⁾ من المؤمنين والمسلمين أنا ننزل عند حكم الله [×] وكتابه[×] والآ⁽¹⁰⁾ يجمع بيننا[×] إلا إياه⁽¹¹⁾ وأن كتاب الله بيننا وبينكم⁽⁹⁾ من فاتحته إلى خاتمته نحى ما أحيا⁽¹²⁾ القرآن⁽¹³⁾ ونميت ما أمات القرآن⁽¹⁴⁾</p>	§1
<p>على ذلك تقاضيا وبه تراضيا⁽¹¹⁾ وأن عليا وشيعته[×] رضوا أن يبعثوا عبد الله⁽¹²⁾ بن قيس ناظرا ومحاكما⁽¹³⁾ ورضي معاوية وشيعته[×] أن يبعثوا عمرو⁽¹⁴⁾ بن العاص ناظرا ومحاكما⁽¹⁵⁾ على أنهم أخذوا عليهما⁽¹⁶⁾ عهد الله وميثاقه[×] وأعظم ما أخذ الله على أحد من خلقه ليتخذان الكتاب إماما فيما بعثنا له لا يعدوانه⁽¹⁷⁾ إلى غيره[×] في الحكم بما⁽¹⁸⁾ وجداه فيه مسطورا وما لم يجداه مسقى في الكتاب⁽¹⁹⁾ رذاه إلى سنة رسول الله الجامعة لا يتعمدان لهما⁽²⁰⁾ خلافا [×] ولا يتبعان في ذلك لهما هوى ولا يدخلان في شبهة⁽²¹⁾</p>	§2	<p>⁽¹⁰⁾ كما وجد الحكمان في كتاب الله بيننا وبينكم فلنهما يتبعانه وما لم يجداه في كتاب الله أخذنا بالسنة العادلة الجامعة غير المفرقة والحكمان عبد الله بن قيس وعمرو بن العاص وأخذنا عليهما عهد الله وميثاقه ليقضيا بما وجداه في كتاب الله فإن لم يجداه في كتاب الله فالسنة الجامعة غير المفرقة</p>	§2

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

<p>و [قد] (٣٣) أخذ عبد الله بن قيس وعمرو بن الماصر على عليّ ومعاوية عهد الله وميثاقه بالرضا بما حكما به ما من (٣٣) كتاب الله وسنة نبيه وليس لهما أن ينقضا ذلك ولا يخالفاه إلى غيره وأتهما (٣٤) آمان في حكومتها (٣٥) على دمائهما وأموالهما [واشعارهما وابشارهما] وأهاليهما [وأولادهما] (٣٦) ما لم يعدوا الحق رضى بذلك راضاً أو أنكره منكر (٣٧) وأن الأمة أنصار لهما (٣٨) على ما قضيا به من العدل (٣٩)</p>	<p>§3 5 5</p>	<p>وأخذ الحكمان من عليّ ومعاوية ومن الجندين ما هما عليه من أمر الناس بما يرضيان به من العهد والميثاق والثقة من الناس أتهما آمان على أموالهما وأهليهما والأمة لهما أنصار على الذى يقضيان به عليهما وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (٣٦) عهد الله إنا على ما فى هذه الصحيفة ولنقوم عليه وإنا عليه لأنصار</p>	<p>§3 5 5</p>
<p>فلن توفى أحد الحكمين قبل انقضاء الحكومة قائمير شيعته وأصحابه يختارون مكانه رجلا لا يألون عن أهل المعدلة والإقساط (٣٠) على ما كان عليه صاحبه من العهد والميثاق والحكم بكتاب الله وسنة رسوله وله مثل شرط صاحبه (٣١) وإن مات أحد الأميرين قبل القضاء (٣٢) فليشيعته أن يولوا مكانه رجلا يرضون عدله وقد وقعت [هذه] (٣٣) القضية[×] ومعها الأمن والتفاوض ووضع السلاح والسلام والموادعة وعلى الحكمين عهد الله وميثاقه ألا يألوا اجتهدا ولا يتعمدا جورا ولا يدخلوا فى شبهة ولا يعدوا حكم الكتاب وسنة رسول الله (٣٥) فإن لم يفعلوا (٣٦) برئت الأمة (٣٧) من حكمها ولا عهد لها ولا نعمة (٣٨) وقد وجبت القضية على ما قد سقى (٣٨) فى هذا الكتاب من مواقع الشروط (٣٩) على الأميرين والحكمين (٤٠) والفريقين[×] والله أقرب شهيدا وأدنى حفيظا (٤١) والناس آمنون</p>	<p>§4 5 10 15</p>	<p>وأتهما (٣٧) قد وجبت القضية[×] بين المؤمنين بالأمن (٣٩) والاستقامة (٤٠) ووضع (٣١) السلاح (٣٢) أينما ساروا (٣٣) على أنفسهم وأموالهم وأهليهم وأرضيهم (٣٤) وشاهدهم وغائبهم (٣٥) وعلى عبد الله بن قيس وعمرو بن الماصر عهد الله وميثاقه ليحكمان (٣٦) بيسن الأمة (٣٧) بالحق (٣٨) ولا يردانها[×] فى فرقة ولا بحرب (٣٩) حتى يقضيا (٣٠) وأجل (٣١) القضية [×] إلى شهر (٣٢) رمضان[×] فإن أحببا أن يعجلا عجلا (٣٣) وإن توفى (٣٥) واحد من (٣٦) الحكمين (٣٧) فلن أمير شيعته (٣٨) يختار (٣٩) مكانه رجلا لا يألوا (٤٠) عن (٤١) المعدلة (٤٢) والقسط (٤٣) وأن ميعاد قضائهما الذى يقضيان فيه (٤٥) مكان عدل بين أهل الشام وأهل الكوفة (٤٦) فلن رضيا مكانا غيره فحيث رضيا لا يحضرهما فيه إلا من أرادا (٤٧) وأن (٤٨) يأخذ الحكمان (٤٩) من شاءا (٥٠) من</p>	<p>§4 5 10 15</p>

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

<p>على أنفسهم واهاليهم [واولادهم] ^(٤٢) واموالهم وإلى انقضاء مدّة الأجل والسّلاح موضوع ^(٤٣) والسّبل مغلّاة ^(٤٤) والغائب والشاهد من الفريقين سواء في الأمن ^(٤٥) وللحكّمين أن ينزلا منزلا عدلا ^(٤٦) بين أهل العراق وأهل الشام ولا يحضرهما فيه إلا من أحبّبا عنّ ملا منهما وتراض ^(٤٧) وإنّ المسلمين قد آجلوا [هذين] القاضيين إلى انسلاخ [شهر] رمضان ^(٤٨) فلن رأى ^(٤٩) الحكّمان تعجيل الحكّومة فيما وجّها له ^(٥٠) عجلّاهما ^(٥١) وإن أرادا تأخيرها بعد [شهر] ^(٥٢) رمضان إلى انقضاء الموسم فلن ذلك ^(٥٣) إليهما ^(٥٤) فلن ^(٥٤) هما لم يحكما بكتاب ^(٥٥) الله وستة نبيه إلى انقضاء الموسم ^(٥٦) فالمسلمون ^(٥٧) على أمرهم الأوّل في الحرب ولا شرط بين [واحد من] الفريقين ^(٥٨) وعلى الأمة عهد الله وميثاقه على التمام والوفاء بما في هذا الكتاب وهم يد على من أراد فيه إلحادا وظلما أو حاول له نقضا ^(٥٩) .</p>	<p>يكتبوا شهادتهم ^(٥١) على ما ^(٥٢) في الصحيفة ^(٥٣) ونحن برا من حكم بخير ما أنزل الله اللّهم إنّنا نستعينك على من ترك ما في هذه الصحيفة وأراد فيها إلحادا وظلما ^(٥٤)</p>
	20
	25
	30
	35

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

× وشهد بما في الكتاب من أصحاب علي (٦٠)		× شهد على ما في هذه الضيقة (٥٥)	
1	عبد الله بن عباس	1	عبد الله بن عباس
2	والأشعث بن قيس	2	والأشعث بن قيس (٥٦)
3	والأشعث مالك بن الحارث (٦١)	3	وسعيد بن قيس (٥٧)
4	وسعيد بن قيس العمداني	4	ورقاه بن سعي (٥٨)
5	والحصين (ابنا الحارث بن المطلب (٦٢)	5	وعبد الله بن الطفيل (٥٩)
6	والطفيل (6	وحجر بن يزيد (٦٠)
7	وأبو أسيد مالك بن ربيعة الأنصاري (٦٣)	7	وعبد الله بن محم (٦١)
8	وخباب بن الأرت (٦٤)	8	وعقبة بن زياد (٦٢)
9	وسهل بن حنيف	9	ويزيد بن حجية (٦٣)
10	وأبو اليسر بن عمرو الأنصاري (٦٥)	10	[ومالك بن كعب] (٦٤)
11	ورفاعه بن رافع بن مالك الأنصاري (٦٦)		
12	وعوف بن الحارث بن المطلب القرشي (٦٧)		
13	وبريدة الأسلمي (٦٨)		
14	وعقبة بن عامر الجهني		
15	ورافع بن خديج الأنصاري		
16	وعمر بن الحق الخراعي		
17	والحسن (
18	والحسين (
19	وعبد الله بن جعفر العاشمي		
20	والنعمان بن عجلان الأنصاري		
21	وحجر بن عدى الكندي		
22	[ويزيد بن حجية البكري] (٦٩)		
23	ورقاه بن (٧٠)		
24	ومالك بن كعب الهمداني		

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

وربيعة بن شرحبيل	25		
وأبو صفرة بن يزيد ^(٧١)	26		
والحارث بن مالك الهمداني ^(٧٢)	27		
وحجر بن يزيد	28		
وعقبة ^(٧٣) بن حجية	29		
ومن أصحاب معاوية ^(٧٤)			(٧٥)
حبيب بن مسلمة الفهري	1	وأبو الأعور السلمي ^(٧٦)	1
وأبو الأعور بن سفيان السلمي ^(٧٥)	2	وحبيب بن مسلمة ^(٧٧)	2
وبسر بن [أبي] ^(٧٦) أوطاة القرشي	3	والمخارق بن الحارث ^(٧٨)	3
ومعاوية بن حديج ^(٧٧) الكندي	4	وزمل بن عمرو ^(٧٩)	4
والمخارق بن الحارث الحميري ^(٧٨)	5	وحمزة بن مالك ^(٨٠)	5
ورعيل ^(٧٩) بن عمرو السكسكي	6	وعبد الرحمن بن خالد ^(٨١)	6
وعبد الرحمن بن خالد المخزومي ^(٨٠)	7	وسبيع بن يزيد ^(٨٢)	7
وحمزة بن مالك الهمداني ^(٨١)	8	وعلقمة بن يزيد ^(٨٣)	8
وسبيع بن يزيد الحضرمي ^(٨٢)	9	وعتبة بن أبي سفيان	9
ويزيد بن الحرّ العبسي ^(٨٣)	10	ويزيد بن الحرّ ^(٨٤)	10
ومسروق بن حرملة ^(٨٤) المعنى	11		
ونعير ^(٨٥) بن يزيد الحميري	12		
وعبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص	13		
وعلقمة بن يزيد الكلبى	14		
وخالد بن المعرض ^(٨٦) السكسكى	15		
وعلقمة بن يزيد الحضرمي ^(٨٧)	16		
وعبد الله بن عامر القرشى	17		
ومروان بن الحكم ^(٨٨)	18		
والوليد بن عقبة القرشى ^(٨٩)	19		

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

وعتبة بن أبي سفيان	20	
ومحمد بن أبي سفيان	21	
ومحمد بن عمرو بن العاص	22	
وزيد بن عمر الجذامي ^(٩٠)	23	
وعمار بن الأحوص الكلبى	24	
ومسعدة بن عمرو التَّجِيبِي ^(٩١)	25	
والحارث بن زياد القينى ^(٩٢)	26	
وعاصم بن المنتشر الجذامى ^(٩٣)	27	
وعبد الرحمن بن ذى الكلاع الحميرى ^(٩٤)	28	
والصباح ^(٩٥) بن جلهمة الحميرى	29	
وشامة بن حوشب	30	
وعلقمة بن حكيم ^(٩٦)	31	
وحمرزة بن مالك ^(٩٧)	32	
<p>× وإنَّ بيننا على ما فى هذه الصحيفة عهد الله وميثاقه^(٩٨)</p>		
وكتب عمر ^(٩٩) يوم الأربعاء لثلاث عشرة ليلة بقيت من صفر سنة سبع وثلاثين ^(١٠٠)		وكتب عميرة يوم الأربعاء لثلاث عشرة بقيت من صفر سنة سبع وثلاثين ^(١٠٥)

وأخذ الحكمان	وأخذ الحكمان من علي بن أبي طالب ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان الذي يرضيان من المهد والميثاق ليرضيان بما يقضيان فيهما من خلع من خلعا وتأخير من أمرا وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية الجندين كليهما	وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية ومن جند كليهما ومن تأمر عليه من الناس عهد الله ليقبلن ما قضيا به عليهما وأخذنا لأنفسهما الذي يرضيان بسببه من المهد والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أنفسهما وأهلبيهما وأموالهمما وأن الأمة لهما أنصار على ما يقضيان به علي ومعاوية وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (بداية سقط من أ)	ومن الحندين وما هما عليه من امر الناس بما يرضيان بسببه من المهد والميثاق والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أموالهما وأهلبيهما و الأمة لهما أنصار على الذي يقضيان به عليهما وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كتبها عهد الله إنا على ما في هذه الصحيفة ولنفوس عليـة وإنا عليه لأنصار
وأخذ الحكمان	وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية ومن جند كليهما ومن تأمر عليه من الناس عهد الله ليقبلن ما قضيا به عليهما وأخذنا لأنفسهما الذي يرضيان بسببه من المهد والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أنفسهما وأهلبيهما وأموالهمما وأن الأمة لهما أنصار على ما يقضيان به علي ومعاوية وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (بداية سقط من أ)	وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية ومن جند كليهما ومن تأمر عليه من الناس عهد الله ليقبلن ما قضيا به عليهما وأخذنا لأنفسهما الذي يرضيان بسببه من المهد والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أنفسهما وأهلبيهما وأموالهمما وأن الأمة لهما أنصار على ما يقضيان به علي ومعاوية وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (بداية سقط من أ)	ومن الحندين وما هما عليه من امر الناس بما يرضيان بسببه من المهد والميثاق والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أموالهما وأهلبيهما و الأمة لهما أنصار على الذي يقضيان به عليهما وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كتبها عهد الله إنا على ما في هذه الصحيفة ولنفوس عليـة وإنا عليه لأنصار
وأخذ الحكمان	وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية ومن جند كليهما ومن تأمر عليه من الناس عهد الله ليقبلن ما قضيا به عليهما وأخذنا لأنفسهما الذي يرضيان بسببه من المهد والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أنفسهما وأهلبيهما وأموالهمما وأن الأمة لهما أنصار على ما يقضيان به علي ومعاوية وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (بداية سقط من أ)	وأخذنا من علي ومعاوية ومن جند كليهما ومن تأمر عليه من الناس عهد الله ليقبلن ما قضيا به عليهما وأخذنا لأنفسهما الذي يرضيان بسببه من المهد والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أنفسهما وأهلبيهما وأموالهمما وأن الأمة لهما أنصار على ما يقضيان به علي ومعاوية وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كليهما (بداية سقط من أ)	ومن الحندين وما هما عليه من امر الناس بما يرضيان بسببه من المهد والميثاق والثقة من الناس أنهما آمنان على أموالهما وأهلبيهما و الأمة لهما أنصار على الذي يقضيان به عليهما وعلى المؤمنين والمسلمين من الطائفتين كتبها عهد الله إنا على ما في هذه الصحيفة ولنفوس عليـة وإنا عليه لأنصار

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

NOTES

Version A

(ص = وقعة صفين ، أ = أنساب الأشراف ، ت = تاريخ الرسل والملوك ، ح = رسالة في الحكمين)

- ١ في ص فقط
- ٢ ت : الكوفة
- ٣ سقط من ت
- ٤ ت : معهم . سقط من أ
- ٥ ت وأ : شيعتهم
- ٦ في ص فقط
- ٧ سقط من أ
- ٨ ت وأ : شيعتهم
- ٩ أ : وبيننا كتاب الله فيما اختلفنا فيه . ح : في كتابه فيما اختلفنا فيه .
" وبينكم " سقط من ت
- ١٠ ت : ولا
- ١١ ت : غيره
- ١٢ أ : يحيى
- ١٣ في ص فقط
- ١٤ في ص فقط
- ١٥ قد أخذنا النص في هذه الفقرة والفقرة التالية من ص ، وتلى مقارنة الروايات
المختلفة لهاتين الفقرتين فيما بعد .
- ١٦ بداية سقط من أ
- ١٧ ت : وأن . ح : وأنه
- ١٨ ت : قضيتهما
- ١٩ ت : على المؤمنين فان الأمن . ح : من المؤبر والامر
- ٢٠ ح : الاستفاضة

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version A)

٢١	ح : رفع
٢٢	يضيف ت : بينهم
٢٣	ح : شأؤوا وكانوا
٢٤	ت : أهليهم وأموالهم • ح : أهاليهم وأموالهم وأرضهم
٢٥	نهاية السقط من أ •
٢٦	ت : أن يحلما • أ : أن يصلحا • ح : ليقضيان •
٢٧	ت : هذه الأمة
٢٨	سقط من أ و ح •
٢٩	ت : يردّاها • أ : يردّاهم • ح : يذراهم (كذا)
٣٠	ت : فى حرب ولا فرقة • أ : فى فرقة ولا حرب • ح : فى الفرقة والحر
٣١	سقط من أ •
٣٢	أ : وأن أجل • ح : وآخر أجل
٣٣	سقط "شهر" من ت • ح : بين الناس فى انسلاخ شهر •
٣٤	ت : وإن احبّا أن يؤخّرا ذلك أخّراه عن تراض منهما • أ : فإن احبّا أن يجلّلاها دون ذلك عجلّا وإن احبّا أن يؤخّراها عن غير ميل منهما أخّراها ح : وإن احبّا أن يؤخّرا ذلك عن ملامتهما وتراض أخّرا •
٣٥	أ : مات • ح : هلك •
٣٦	ت وأ و ح : أحد
٣٧	يضيف أ : قبل القضاء •
٣٨	يضيف أ : وشيعته • يضيف ح : والشعبة
٣٩	أ و ح • يختارون
٤٠	ت : ولا
٤١	أ و ح : يألون
٤٢	ت : من
٤٣	أ و ح : أهل المعدلة
٤٤	أ : والنصيحة والاقساط • ح : والاقتصاد (كذا)

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version A)

- ٤٥ ت : وأنّ مكان قضيتهما الذى يقضيان فيه . أ : وأن يكون مكان قضيتهما
التي يقضيانها فيه . ح : وأنّ ميعاد القضية أن يقضيا ب .
- ٤٦ ت : مكان عدل بين أهل الكوفة وأهل الشام . أ : مكان عدل بين
الكوفة والشام والحجاز . ح : بمكان من أهل الكوفة وأهل الحجاز وأهل
الشام سوا .
- ٤٧ ت : وإن رضيا وأحباً فلا يحضرهما فيه إلا من أراد . أ : لا يحضرهما فيه
إلا من أراد فإن رضيا مكانا غيره فحيث أحباً أن يقضيا . ح : لا يحضرهما
فيه إلا من أراد فإن أحباً أن يكون بأدرج وبدومة الجندل كان ، وإن رضيا
مكانا غيره حيث أحباً فليقضيا على علي ومعاوية أن يجتمعا على الحكيم .
(هنا نهاية نص ح وتليه أسماء بعض الشهود)
- ٤٨ " أن " سقط من ت
- ٤٩ يضيف أ : من كل واحد
- ٥٠ ت : أراد
- ٥١ ت : يكتبان شهادتهما
- ٥٢ سقط من أ
- ٥٣ ت و أ : هذه الصحيفة
- ٥٤ ت : وهم أنصار على من ترك ما فى هذه الصحيفة وأراد فيه إلحادا وظلما
اللهم إنا نستنصرك على من ترك ما فى هذه الصحيفة
أ : إنهم أنصار على من ترك ما فيها اللهم نستنصرك على من ترك ما فى .
هذه الصحيفة وأراد فيها إلحادا وظلما
- ٥٥ ت : شهد من أصحاب على . أ : وشهد من كل جند على الفريقين عشرة
من أهل العراق . ح : وشهد .
- ٥٦ يضيف ت : الكندى
- ٥٧ أ : سعد بن قيس . ويضيف ت و أ : الهمداني
- ٥٨ ص و ج : ورفا ، و "سقى" سقط من ح . وفى أ : وفا . بن سقى وبعضهم
يقول ورفا . بن سقى وورفا . أصح ذلك . ويضيف ت : البجلي . ويضيف ح :
الكبرى الخارفى (كذا) .

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version A)

- ٥٩ أ و ح : عبد الله بن طفيل • ويضيف ت : العامري • ويضيف ح :
البيكاوي ويقال عبد الله بن طليق البيكاوي •
- ٦٠ ت : حجر بن عدى • ح : جرير بن يزيد • ويضيف ت و أ وح : الكندي
- ٦١ ص : عبد الله بن جمل • أ و ح : عبد الله بن حجل • ويضيف أ :
الكبرى • ويضيف ت وح : العجلي •
- ٦٢ ص : عقبة بن جارية • ح : عتبة بن زياد • ويضيف ت : الحضرمي •
ويضيف ح : المذحجي أو الأنصاري •
- ٦٣ سقط هذا الاسم من ح • ويضيف ت و أ : التيمي •
- ٦٤ سقط هذا الاسم من ص • ويضيف ت : الهمداني • ويضيف أ : الأرحبي •
ويضيف ح : النحلي (كذا) أو الهمداني ويقال عتبة بن زيد ويقال زياد
بن كعب • (وهنا تنتهي رواية ح)
- ٦٥ ت : ومن أصحاب معاوية • أ : ومن أهل الشام
- ٦٦ ت : أبو الأعور السلمي عمرو بن سفيان • أ : أبو الأعور عمرو بن سفيان
السلمي
- ٦٧ يضيف ت و أ : الفهري
- ٦٨ يضيف ت و أ : الزبيدي
- ٦٩ يضيف ت و أ : العذري
- ٧٠ يضيف ت و أ : الهمداني
- ٧١ يضيف ت : المخرومي • ويضيف أ : بن الوليد المخرومي
- ٧٢ يضيف ت : الأنصاري • ويضيف أ : الحضرمي
- ٧٣ ص : علقمة بن مرشد • ويضيف ت : الأنصاري • ويضيف أ : أخو سبيع هذا
- ٧٤ أ : يزيد بن الجر • ويضيف ت و أ : العبسي
- ٧٥ سقطت هذه الجملة من ت و أ •

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

NOTES

Version B

- (ص = وقعة صفين ط = الأخباز الطوال ش = شرح نهج البلاغة)
- ١ ش : رسوله
٢ ط : شاهدهم وغائبهم
٣ سقط من ص . وفي ط : وقضية معاوية على أهل الشام شاهدهم وغائبهم
٤ ش : أننا
٥ ط : تراضينا
٦ ط : نقف
٧ ط : يحكم
٨ سقط من ط
٩ ش : كتاب الله حكما بيننا
١٠ ش : ما أحيا القرآن ونميت ما أماته
١١ ش و ط : تراضينا . . . تراضينا
١٢ ط : رضوا بعبد الله
١٣ ط : وحاكما
١٤ ط : بعمر
١٥ ط : وحاكما
١٦ ط : على أن عليا ومعاوية أخذا على عبد الله بن قيس وعمر بن العاص
١٧ ط : ودمته ودمه رسول الله أن يتخذا القرآن إماما ولا يحدوا به
١٨ ش : ما
١٩ ط : وما لم يجدا في الكتاب
٢٠ ط و ش : لها
٢١ ط : ولا يبخيان فيها بشبهة . "في ذلك لهما" سقط من ش .
٢٢ في ش فقط
٢٣ ط : في
٢٤ ط : ولهما
٢٥ ش : حكمهما

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version B)

الزيادة من ط	٢٦
ط : سخطه ساخط	٢٧
ط : أنصارهما	٢٨
ط : الحق مما في كتاب الله	٢٩
ط : فليشيعته وأصحابه أن يختاروا مكانه رجلا من أهل المعدلة والصلاح	٣٠
سقط من ط	٣١
ط : قبل انقضاء الأجل المحدود في هذه القضية	٣٢
في ث فقط	٣٣
ط : [وقد وقعت هذه القضية] والمفاوضة ورنع السلاح	٣٤
سقط من ث	٣٥
ث : يقبلا	٣٦
يشير ص هنا إلى بداية سقط من "كتاب ابن عقبة" .	٣٧
ط : سئينا	٣٨
ط : موقع الشرط	٣٩
ث : الحكيمين والأميرين	٤٠
ط : والله أقرب شهيد وكفى به شهيدا فإن خالفا وتعديا فالأمة بريئة	٤١
من حكمهما ولا عهد لهما ولا ذمة . انظر من سطر ١٣ إلى سطر ١٤	
الزيادة في ط	٤٢
ط : موضوعة	٤٣
ط : آمنة	٤٤
ث : الشاهد والنائب الخ ؛ ط : والنائب من الفريقين مثل الشاهد	٤٥
في الامر	
ط : منزلا متوسطا عدلا	٤٦
ط : عن تراخ منهما	٤٧
ط : والأجل الى انقضاء شهر رمضان . والزيادة في ث	٤٨
ث : رأيا	٤٩
سقط من ط	٥٠
ط : وإن رأيا تأخيرها إلى آخر الأجل آخرهما	٥١

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version B)

الزيادة فى ش	٥٢
ش : فذلك	٥٣
ش : وإن	٥٤
ط : بما فى كتاب	٥٥
ط : الأجل	٥٦
ط : الفريقين	٥٧
سقط من ط • والزيادة فى ش	٥٨
ط : وعلى الأمة عهد الله وميثاقه فى هذا الامر وهم جميعا يد واحدة على من أراد فى هذا الأمر إلحادا أو ظلما أو خلافا •	٥٩
ط : شهد على ما فى هذا الكتاب • وأسماء الشهداء غير موجودة فى ش، إنما يقول : وشهد فيه من أصحاب على عشرة ومن أصحاب معاوية عشرة •	٦٠
ط : الأشر بن الحارث	٦١
ط : عبد المطلب	٦٢
ط : أبو سعيد بن ربيعة الأنصارى	٦٣
ط : عبد الله بن خباب بن الارت	٦٤
ط : أبو بشر بن عمر الأنصارى	٦٥
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٦٦
ط : عوف بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب	٦٧
ط : يزيد بن عبد الله الأسلى	٦٨
الزيادة فى ط، ولكن "الكنزى" غلط - كان تيميًا وبكرًا •	٦٩
ص: ورقاء بن مالك بن كعب الهمداني • ولا يرد "ورقاء" بن " فى ط • يظهر أن هنا الاسمين وقاء (أو ورقاء) بن سميّ الجلى ومالك بن كعب الهمداني - انظر nos. 4 and 10 of version A	٧٠
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٧١
سقط "الهمداني" من ط	٧٢
ط : علبة	٧٣
ط : ومن أهل الشام • ويشير ص هنا إلى نهاية السقط من "كتاب بن عقبة"	٧٤

THE SIFFIN ARBITRATION AGREEMENT

(Version B)

ط : أبو الأعور السلسي	٧٥
الزيادة في ط	٧٦
ص : خديج	٧٧
Version A no.3 and Caskel, II, p.426 انظر - انظر	٧٨
ط : مسلم	٧٩
ط : عبد الرحمن بن خالد بن الوليد	٨٠
سقط "العمداني" من ط .	٨١
Version A, no.7 ص : الهمداني . انظر	٨٢
Version A, no.10 ص : يزيد بن الجبر الثقفي . ط : يزيد بن أبحر العبسي . انظر	٨٣
ط : جبلة	٨٤
ط : بسر أو بشر	٨٥
ط : الحصين	٨٦
Version A, no.8 ص : الجرمي . انظر	٨٧
ص : سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٨٨
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٨٩
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٩٠
ط : العتبي	٩١
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٩٢
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٩٣
سقط "الحميري" من ط	٩٤
ص : القباح	٩٥
ط : حكم	٩٦
سقط هذا الاسم من ط	٩٧
سقطت هذه الجملة من ط و ش	٩٨
سقط من ط	٩٩
ش : وتاريخ كتابته لليلة بقيت من صفر سنة سبع وثلاثين	١٠٠