

**HISTORICAL MEMORY OF A TEXT:
KHABAR DESCRIBING THE JEWS FROM KHAYBAR
IN KITĀB AL-ISTIQṢĀ
BY AḤMAD B. KHĀLID AL-NĀṢIRĪ***

Marek M. DZIEKAN
University of Lodz, Poland

BIBLID [1133-8571] 23 (2016) 9-22

Resumen: El presente artículo analiza las transformaciones experimentadas en el *khavar* que describe la abolición de la *jizya* impuesta a los judíos residentes en Khaybar. La historia comenzó en el siglo X, con una obra de Hilāl al-Ṣābiʿ, que fue incluida posteriormente, con algunas variantes, en las historiografías de otros autores de épocas más tardías, llegando hasta el siglo XIX. Fue probablemente entonces cuando se recoge la última referencia a la cuestión en la obra del historiador marroquí Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī. El artículo analiza también la función que desempeña el *khavar* en la obra cuando es citado.

Palabras clave: Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī, memoria histórica, memoria colectiva, *khavar*, historiografía árabe, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī

Abstract: The article analyses the transformations that occurred in the *khavar* describing abolishment of the *jizya* for the Jews living in Khaybar. This story first emerged in the 10th century, in a work by Hilāl al-Ṣābiʿ, and later, with various alterations, it was included in historiographies by other authors from the subsequent epochs until the 19th century. It was probably then that it was last referenced by a Moroccan historian, Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī. The article also analyses the function played by the *khavar* in the work where it is quoted.

Keywords: Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī, historical memory, collective memory, *khavar*, Arab historiography, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī.

* Article written with the support of National Science Centre, project no. 2014 / 15 / B / HS3 / 02260.

ملخص: تقدم هذه المقالة دراسة للتحويلات الواقعة على الخبر الذي يصف إلغاء الجزية المفروضة على اليهود المقيمين في خيبر. ظهرت القصة لأول مرة في القرن العاشر، في كتاب لجلال الصايغ، وقد تم إدراجها مع بعض التعديلات في المؤلفات التاريخية لعدة مؤلفين منتمين إلى عصور لاحقة، حتى القرن التاسع عشر. ومن الأرجح أن آخر من درس هذا الموضوع هو المؤرخ المغربي أحمد الناصري. كما تقدم المقالة دراسة تحليلية للدور الذي يضطلع به الخبر في الكتاب المذكور أعلاه عند اقتباسه.

كلمات مفاتيح: أحمد الناصري، الذاكرة التاريخية، الذاكرة الجماعية، الخبر، علم التاريخ العربي، جلال الدين السيوطي.

I. Introduction

Historical memory, understood as the way history functions in the consciousness of societies and individuals is one of the most important manifestations of their continuation. It is apparent in everyday life, literature, art, and finally in history itself and, in consequence, in historiography. Therefore it can be concluded that historical memory is perpetuated mainly through texts – understood either as written text or more widely – as a cultural text.

In Arab culture, similarly to any other culture, historical memory is revealed, among others, in history writings. Classic Arab-Muslim historiography, described by Franz Rosenthal as *khavar* history is the ideal example of how the memory of a text persists and it is the focus of this article. An analysis of selected examples could demonstrate which elements of the historical memory were preserved and which underwent various – intentional or otherwise – changes and what and how changeable roles were played by specific information conveyed in the selected writings, and finally – when such recordings of memory were transformed. An example of such text in Arab tradition (both, the original oral tradition and its later, written form) could be the *khavar*, the oldest form of Arab historiography, a short narrative which is the continuation of old-Arabic stories about the “Days of the Arabs”⁽¹⁾, frequently preceded, similarly as the *hadith*, by a tradents series – *isnad*.

I would like to emphasise that through historical memory is not to be

(1) F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, Leiden, Brill, 1968, p. 66 and subs.; A. J. Wensinck, *Khavar*, in: The Encyclopaedia of Islam, CD-ROM Edition v.1.1., Leiden, Brill, 2001.

conflated herein with the concept of collective memory as it was understood by the creator of this concept, Maurice Halbwachs ⁽²⁾, but it remains within the in framework proposed by the author of this concept, Yuri Lotman, in his work *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*:

“The text is not only the generator of new meanings, but also a condenser of cultural memory. A text has the capacity to preserve the memory of its previous contexts. Without this function, there could be no science of history, since the culture of preceding ages (and more broadly speaking, its picture of life) inevitably comes down to us in fragments. If a text stayed in the consciousness of the perceiver only as itself, then the past would be represented to us as a mosaic of disconnected fragments. But for the perceiver a text is always a metonymy of a reconstructed integral meaning, a discrete sign of a non-discrete essence. The sum of the contexts in which a given text acquires interpretation and which are in a way incorporated in it may be termed as text’s memory. This meaning-space created by the text around itself enters into relationship with the cultural memory (tradition) already formed in the consciousness of the audience. As a result the text acquires semiotic life” ⁽³⁾.

II. *Khabar* concerning the Jews from Khaybar in *Kitāb al-istiḡṣā*

The aim of this article is to present a history of a short (quasi) historical record given in the introduction to *al-Istiḡṣā li-akhbār duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* or *The Analysis of Records on Dynasties of the Farthest West* (1894) by a Moroccan historian from the 19th century, Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī⁽⁴⁾. This work is the

-
- (2) M. Halbwachs, *The collective memory*, New York, Harper & Row Colophon Books, 1980 (1st ed. French 1939).
- (3) Y. M. Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, transl. by A. Shukman, London-New York, I. B. Tauris, 2001, p. 18.
- (4) Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Khālid al-Nāṣirī al-Salāwī was born in Salé in 1835. He is often regarded as the most eminent representative of Moroccan literature in the 19th century. He was educated in the Muslim classics in his hometown, which at that time was one of the prominent scientific centres in the country. In 1875 al-Nāṣirī entered the *makhzan* service (the native Moroccan government) and served various government roles in Casablanca, Marrakech, Salé, El Jadida (Mazagan), Tangier, and Fez, and at the end of his life he was giving lectures in Salé, where he died in 1897. Comp. e.g.: É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens des chorfa. Essai sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVIe au XXe siècle*, Paris, E. Larose, 1922, pp. 350-368; J. en-Nāṣirī and M. en-Nāṣirī, “Biographie de

first history of Morocco in historiography and covers the time frame from the Arab-Muslim conquest until the death of Sultan Ḥasan I in 1894. The introduction to the chronicle, part of which is the *khavar* discussed herein, is titled *Muqaddima fī faql al-tārīkh* (“Introduction concerning the superiority of [the science of] history”). It comprises several small units of various types and begins with a sort of introduction, which is highly theoretical in nature, with characteristic references to the Quran, followed by several *khavars* which extoll the benefits of studying history – one of these concerns the Jews of Khaybar⁽⁵⁾.

And this is the translation of the *khavar* which is analysed in this article:

“Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, may God have mercy on him, said: An example [of the benefits from studying history – MMD] can be the conflict between the commander (*raʾīs al-ruʾasāʾ*) of the ʿAbbasid Caliph, al-Qāʾim bi-Amr Allāh⁽⁶⁾ and the Jews, which arose in Baghdad. The result of the events was such that they showed an old document, where it stated that the Prophet commanded that the *jizya* not be collected from the Jews of Khaybar. The document bore a witness testimony from the Prophet’s Companions, including ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. The document was given to the commander and caused amazement among the people.

l’auteur du Kitāb el-istiḡā, le cheikh Ahmed Ben Khāled en-Nācīri el-Selāoui”, *Archives marocaines*, XXX (1923); K. Brown, “Profile of a Nineteenth-Century Moroccan Scholar”, in: N. R. Keddie (ed.), *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis. Muslim Religious Institutions since 1500*, Berkeley- Los Angeles-London, University of California Press, 1978, pp. 127-148; B. Dennerlein, “Entre restauration et (ré-) ordonnance. L’appropriation savante de la réforme chez Ahmed b. Khaled an-Nasiri (1835-1897)”, in: O. Moreau (éd.) *Réformes de l’État et réformismes au Maghreb (XIXe-XXe siècles)*, Paris, L’Harmattan - Institut de Recherche sur le Maghreb Contemporain, 2009, pp. 197-210; E. Calderwood, “The Beginning (or End) of Moroccan History: Historiography, Translation, and Modernity in Ahmad b. Khalid an-Nasiri and Clemente Cerdeira”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 44 (2012), pp. 399-420.

- (5) The introductions to various historical writings – both chronicles as well as biographies are not anything unusual in Arab historiography. The contents of such introductions also vary. The analysis of approx. 40 works of this type (I considered only works preserved in full, not as quotes in works by other authors), beginning from al-Yaʿqūbī (died 897) to 20th century works which are at least partially classical in their nature, such as *Tārīkh Tiḡwān* (History of Tetouan) by Muḥammad Dāwud (1901-1984), shows that almost all these works are preceded by an introduction more or less theoretical and methodological in nature.

- (6) Born 1001, ruled 1031-1075.

Then the document was shown to Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who analysed it and declared it a forgery. They asked him why he deemed it so. He replied that the document bore the testimony of Muʿāwiya, and he converted to Islam in the year of conquest of Mecca, that is in the eighth year since the hijra [630 C. E.], while Khaybar was conquered in the 7th year since the hijra. The document also bore the testimony of Saʿd b. Muʿādh⁽⁷⁾, and he died on the day of Banū Qurayza, which occurred before the conquest of Khaybar. The people rejoiced at this decision and wondered no more ⁽⁸⁾.

Most frequently the textological histories of the *khbars* included by the Moroccan in *Muqaddima* do not reach too deep (which absolutely does not decrease their value). The only exception is the single *khbar* where the author refers to the authority of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī.

For the purposes of this analysis, it is a significant fact that the version quoted above is the most recent one – I could not find this *khbar* in later historical writings. It should also be emphasised here that the analysis below does not focus on the historical context of the event from 628, but on the persistence of its record.

The record described events from the early 7th century and their echoes in mid-11th century. At that time, it was most likely preserved in various oral traditions, which constitute the part of memory/history of the *khbar* that is impossible to reconstruct today (the possible internal and external transformations, compare below). Despite clear differences between the concept of oral history and an oral record in Arab culture, the essence of this phenomenon remains the same. The important aspect here is that the later written record preserves many elements of oral history also in the sense that oral history is understood by its researchers, but which, however, will not be considered in this article⁽⁹⁾.

(7) Saʿd b. Muʿādh (died 627), the leader of the Medina clan of ʿAbd al-Ašhal.

(8) Al-Nāṣirī, *Kitāb al-istiṣā*, Cairo, 1897, vol. I, s. 3; The text was consulted with the subsequent editions (1997, 2001, 2010). French transl.: *Kitāb el istiṣā...*, Archives marocaines, XXX (1923), p. 59.

(9) Compare the definition cited by D. Lance: “[O]ral history is formed from the personal reminiscences of people who were participants in or witnesses of the events or experiences they recount”. D. Lance, *An Archive Approach to Oral History*, Imperial War Museum, International Association of Sound Archives, London 1978, ed. online: <http://www.iasa->

The analysis of historical sources points to an unusual lifespan of this *khabar*, especially in the Maghreb region, although it is unrelated with the works itself. Earlier, three orientalist showed some interest in the *khabar*: Évariste Lévi-Provençal⁽¹⁰⁾, Adam Mez⁽¹¹⁾ and Franz Rosenthal⁽¹²⁾. Among the contemporary Arab authors the problem was reviewed by Khālid b. Muḥammad b. Ghānim Āl Thānī in an article from 2012⁽¹³⁾.

Mez only refers to the *khabar*, preceding it with a comment – “Fraud prospered.” This reference is to the oldest version of the record, from *Kitāb al-wuzarāʾ* (The Book of Visiers) by Hilāl al-Ṣābiʿ (969-1056):

“Abū l-Qāsim Karib b. Karib said that Ibn al-Furāt was informed that some Jew claimed that he had a document from the Prophet, Peace be with him. He then commanded him to show the document and when he had read it, he said: It is a forgery, because Khaybar was conquered 67 days after the date on your document. However, I will refrain from collecting *jizya* from you in honour of the one you invoke. Abū l-Qāsim b. Karib said: It was then verified in historical records and it turned out that it was just as Ibn al-Furāt had said ⁽¹⁴⁾”.

In this re-telling, the main role is played by the ʿAbbasid visier, Abū l-Ḥasan b. al-Furāt, killed in 924. He does not appear in the latter versions of this record, which was shifted in time by over 100 years. The main themes remain – the forgery of the document stipulating the abolition of *jizya* for the Jews of Khaybar and the discovery of that forgery by a scholar (Ibn al-Furāt was not

web.org/archive-approach-oral-history (06.03.2016). The problem of direct witness in Arab culture is effected through an *isnād* that recalls the eyewitness of the events. In the case of the *khabar* analysed herein, the eyewitness is not known.

(10) É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens...*, op. cit., p. 25 and subsequent.

(11) A. Mez, *The Renaissance of Islam*, transl. S. Kh. Baksh, D. S. Margoliouth, Patna, The Jubilee Printing and Publishing House, 1939, p. 338.

(12) F. Rosenthal, *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship*, Roma, Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1947, p. 47; *A History...*, op. cit., p. 279.

(13) Kh. b. M. b. Gh. Āl Thānī, “Ilm al-tārīkh wa-l-tarājim”, *Ṣawt al-Umma*, n° 4 (2012).

(14) Abū l-Ḥasan al-Hilāl al-Ṣābiʿ, *al-Wuzarāʾ*, *Maktabat al-Aʿyān*, without place and date, pp. 77-78.

only a politician, but also a scholar and writer⁽¹⁵⁾. This story is then placed in early 10th century and related by a less-known Abū l-Qāsim Karib b. al-Karib. It is most likely the oldest version of this *khbar*.

This record is found again in a chronicle *al-Muntaẓam fī tārikh al-mulūk wa-l-umam* (An Ordered Chronicle of the History of Kings and Nations) by Ibn al-Jawzī (1126-1200), several dozen years later, in a biographical note concerning al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī⁽¹⁶⁾, where it is related in the form known from al-Nāṣirī's work. After returning from Mecca, al-Khaṭīb was supposedly become close with the circles of Abū l-Qāsim b. Maslama, who in this record is referred to both in name as well as *raʿīs al-ruʿasāʾ*. The *khbar* is related without the *isnād*.

According to the author's research, the record of the forged document is again reiterated by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (1179-1229) in *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ* (Dictionary of Writers), where he describes the life of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī⁽¹⁷⁾. This author refers to *al-Muntaẓam* by Ibn al-Jawzī. Yāqūt only supplies additional information about Abū l-Qāsim Ibn Maslama, adding that he was the wazir of the caliph, al-Qāʾim, and leaves the record unchanged. However, he later adds new information about *raʿīs al-ruʿasāʾ* not related by Ibn al-Jawzī, but not connected directly with the *khbar* of interest herein, and then he returns to the record from *al-Muntaẓam*.

Yet another iteration of this story is related by Ibn Kathīr (1300-1373). He places the *khbar*, quoted in the *al-Bidāya wa-l-Nihāya* chronicle (The Beginning and the End) in the narrative of the Prophet's history. The *khbar* is introduced through the word *qultu* ("I said")⁽¹⁸⁾, which suggests that the passage is from the author's own knowledge, but whose source is a different work than those listed above, because it does not mention either Abū l-Qāsim b. Maslama

(15) Ibn Khallikan's *Biographical Dictionary, Translated from the Arabic by Baron Mac Guckin De Slane*, Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Paris, 1843, vol. 2, pp. 355-364.

(16) Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī tārikh al-mulūk wa-l-umam*, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1995, vol. XVI, p. 129.

(17) Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ. Al-Irṣād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*, Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1993, vol. I, p. 386.

(18) Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, Damascus, Dār Ibn Kathīr, 2010, vol. IV, p. 447. In a slightly different version, but one that makes no significant changes, Ibn Kathīr quotes this story in another place – *ibid.*, vol. V, p. 505.

or al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, so the *khavar* should probably be quoted here in full:

“I said: Already after the year 300, the Jews of Khaybar claimed that they had a document from the God’s Prophet, Peace be with Him, where he abolishes their *jizya*. Some scholars were tricked and confirmed the abolition of the *jizya* for them, among the Shāfi‘is – the sheikh Abū ‘Alī ibn Khayrūn. And this is a forged document, a lie, a fabrication, which has no foundations. Its worthlessness has been declared by many scholars in their works, because many companions opposed it in their writings, such as Ibn al-Ṣabbāgh in *Shāmil*, sheikh Abū Ḥāmid in *Ta‘līq*, and Ibn Maslama dedicated a separate section in his work to criticise this document. They discussed it after the year 700 and showed the book where there was a document proving what their companions related in their books. I read it and deemed it a forgery, because it contains a testimony by Sa‘d ibn Mu‘ādh, who died before the conquest of Khaybar, by Mu‘āwiya ibn Abī Sufyān, who at that time had not yet converted to Islam, and because it was written by ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. It is a lie and an error. It discusses *jizya*, which at that time was not ordered by law.”

There is also another interesting theme here – it is Ibn Kathīr who ultimately deems the document presented by the Jews as a forgery. It seems that this theme is not continued later anywhere else.

The historian, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī (1297-1363), the author of the biographical dictionary *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* (The Full Book of Lives), relates the story in the introduction to the dictionary, whose ninth volume is titled *Fī fawā'id al-tārīkh* (On the Benefits of History)⁽¹⁹⁾. Thus the *khavar* appeared for the first time in a context, in which it remained until the 19th-century historiographies. It is the story of the forged Prophet’s document that al-Ṣafadī puts at the front of his deliberations on the benefits of historical knowledge. The *khavar* is quoted without a source reference.

Another author who included the *khavar* analysed herein is Muḥammad al-Shiblī al-Dimashqī (1312-1368) in his work *Maḥāsīn al-wasā'il fī ma'rifat al-awā'il* (The Best Path to Knowledge About Those Who Were First). The record is quoted at the end of the work, in a chapter titled *Fī fawā'id min ma'rifat al-tārīkh* (On the Benefits of Historical Knowledge; this time it is not an

(19) al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 2000, p. 55.

introduction, although it is similar in character to other works analysed in this article). In the *khbar*, there are no changes whatsoever in comparison with the version provided by al-Ṣafadī⁽²⁰⁾.

The next work that includes the *khbar* about the Jews of Khaybar is the book dedicated to methods of research and understanding of history, *al-Iʿlān bi-l-tawbīkh li-man dhamma ahl al-tārīkh* (Condemnation of Those Who Admonish Historians) by Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī (1427-1497). In this case, in terms of contents, an interesting point is that the text provides a specific date for the events – 447 H. (1055-1056 C. E.)⁽²¹⁾. The text is without an *isnād* and is incorporated into a theoretical introduction concerning history and its importance, which discusses, among others, fabrications of historical record. Thus the story appears again in an introduction to a historiographical work.

The last representative of a post-classical period who quotes this *khbar* is Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. The *khbar* is included in *Naẓm al-ʿiqyān fī aʿyān al-aʿyān* (A Necklace of Pure Gold about the Greatest of the Great)⁽²²⁾. This work is a biographical dictionary of eminent personalities living in the 9th century after the hijra and the author provided an introduction, *Muqaddima fihā fawāʿid manthūra tataʿallaq bi-l-tārīkh* (The Introduction, Where Various Benefits of History are Discussed). The text is introduced with the phrase “and another said” and therefore the *isnad* was excluded. It is the version with *raʿīs al-ruʿasāʿ*² and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, which became the classic version of this story.

Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Qarāfī was writing in the second half of the 16th century. His *Tawshīh ad-dībāj* (Clarifying Silk) contains the *raʿīs al-ruʿasāʿ*² record. The text is included in the author’s introduction to the book, again without the *isnad*. However, the editor and critic of this edition, ʿAlī ʿUmar, points out that this is a quote from *Naẓm al-ʿiqyān* by al-Suyūṭī⁽²³⁾.

The next generation saw Aḥmad Bābā al-Tinbuktī (1556-1626)⁽²⁴⁾, a

(20) M. b. ʿA. A. al-Shiblī al-Dimashqī, *Maḥāsīn al-wasāʾil fī maʿrifat al-awāʾil*, Beirut, Dār al-Nafāʾis, 1992, p. 403.

(21) Sh. D. al-Sakhāwī, *al-Iʿlān bi-l-tawbīkh li-man dhamma ahl al-tārīkh*, Beirut, Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1986, p. 26.

(22) J. D. al-Suyūṭī, *Naẓm al-ʿiqyān fī aʿyān al-aʿyān*, Beirut, al-Maktaba al-ʿIlmiyya, 1927, p. 6.

(23) Al-Qarāfī, *Tawshīh ad-dībāj wa-ḥilyat al-ibtihāj*, Cairo, Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2004, p.19.

(24) É. Lévi-Provençal, “Aḥmad Bābā”, in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. CD-Rom Edition*, op.cit.; ibid., *Les historiens...*, op.cit., p. 250-255; C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen*

Muslim scholar and historian who was, for some time, connected with Marrakesh. One of his most important works is *Nayl al-ibtihāj bi-taṭrīz al-dībāj*⁽²⁵⁾. (Achieving Happiness in Embroidering Silk), which is a biographical dictionary of eminent scholars from the Mālikī *madhhab*. In the introduction to this work, the *khavar* is quoted in a similar version as in al-Nāṣirī's work, however without any references to the sources. It is introduced through the *wa-qāla* ("and he said") formula, most likely referring to earlier citations introduced through *qāla ba'ḍuhum* ("someone said").

Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Qādirī (1712-1773)⁽²⁶⁾ quotes al-Qarāfī and Aḥmad Bābā, whom he calls al-Sūdānī, in the introduction to *Nashr al-mathānī* (Spreading of Repeated). The quote does not include any new information except mentioning also al-Qarāfī and al-Tinbukṭī, but it does not attempt to reach deeper to the sources of the *khavar*.

A similar treatment was given by Muḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Dar'ī (died 1796 or 1797)⁽²⁷⁾, connected with the Nāṣiriyya brotherhood, in his biographical dictionary, *al-Durar al-muraṣṣa'a bi-akḥbār a'yān Dar'a* (Threaded Pearls of News on the Eminent People of Dar'a)⁽²⁸⁾. The text is quoted without the *isnad* and was additionally slightly shortened – there is no mention of the *ra'īs al-ru'asā'*, but this problem is solved again by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī.

The *khavar* about the Jews of Khaybar appears also in the popular history chronicle from the creation of the world, by a Moroccan historian, Abū l-Qāsim al-Zayyānī (1734-1833)⁽²⁹⁾ *al-Tarjumān al-mu'rib 'an duwal al-Mashriq wa-l-*

Litteratur, op.cit, p. 618; *ibid.*, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur. Zweiter Supplementband*, op. cit., pp. 715-716.

(25) The most recent edition: Tripoli, Kulliyyat al-Da'wa al-Islāmiyya, 1989.

(26) G. Deverdun, "al-Qādirī", in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. CD-Rom Edition*, op.cit.; É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens...*, op. cit., p. 319-326; M. Lakhdar, *La vie littéraire au Maroc sous la dynastie 'alawide*, Rabat, Éditions Techniques Nord-Africaines, 1971, pp. 240-241.

(27) Ibn Sūda, *Ithāf al-maṭāli'*, Beirut, Dār al-Maghrib al-Islāmī, 1977, vol. I, p. 83.

(28) Compare: manuscript from Maktabat Mu'assasat al-Malik 'Abd al-'Azīz in Casablanca, available online: <https://archive.org/details/dorar-morassa3a> (07.02.2016), pp. 6-7; in 2014 a printed version was published by al-Mu'assasa al-Nāṣiriyya li-l-Thaqāfa wa-l-'Ilm, Salé.

(29) Compare: on the subject: C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur. Zweiter Supplementband*, op. cit., pp. 878-879; É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les Historiens...*, pp. 145-199. Dar'a is a geographical area on the river by the same name, in south Morocco.

Maghrib (Clear Interpreter about the Countries of the East and West)⁽³⁰⁾. It introduces a new motif, absent from the other iterations of this record. *Raʿīs al-ruʿasāʿ*, before he turned to al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, showed the document to a group of other scholars, who did not find anything suspicious. This explicitly emphasises the knowledge of al-Khaṭīb and his authority as a scholar. The text is included in the beginning and contains no *isnād*.

One of the most eminent representatives of Moroccan historiography of the 19th century is Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Kansūsī (Akansūs, 1796-1877)⁽³¹⁾. His most important work is the chronicle of the Alawites, published in full only in 1918, but already well known during the author's lifetime, titled *al-Jaysh al-ʿaramram al-khumāsī fī dawlat Mawlānā ʿAlī al-Sijilmāsī* (Innumerable Fivefold Army or About the State of Mawlānā ʿAlī al-Sijilmāsī). The introduction to this work also contains the *khbar* about the Jews of Khaybar. And it is al-Kansūsī who cites Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī⁽³²⁾. Undoubtedly it was directly from that source that Aḥmad al-Nāṣirī took the record, because no author of any other text refers to the iteration by al-Suyūṭī. This is also evidenced by the fact that another account – this time about the Jews of Fes is also included in al-Kansūsī's work.

Thus the history of the *khbar* has been traced – it gives the account of events from 628, but appears in historiography in reference to events of early 10th century. It was preserved in the memory of the generations in the form shaped by the 12th-century scholar, Ibn al-Jawzī.

The *khbar* concerning the Jews of Khaybar plays an interesting role in the works listed here. Initially it was related as purely informational account, but gradually transformed into typical evidence of the benefits of studying history.

(30) The author uses the manuscript from the Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University, n° 8289 available online, p. 3: <http://ia801302.us.archive.org/zipview.php?zip=/6/items/m-alema8001/8289.zip&file=8289%2FDSC00006.JPG> (07.02.2016). The edition and translation by Houdas (Aboulgasem ben Ahmed Al-Ezziani, *Le Maroc de 1631-1812, extrait de l'ouvrage intitulé Et Tordjeman el Moarib publié et trad. par O. Houdas*, Paris, École des langues orientales vivantes, 1886, reprint Kessinger Publishing, Whitesfish (Montana), 2010 covers only a part of the text.

(31) Compare: C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur. Zweiter Supplementband0*, op. cit., pp. 884-885; É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les Historiens...*, pp. 200-213; *ibid.*, "Akansūs", in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. CD-Rom Edition, op. cit.; Ibn Sūda, op. cit., p. 260.

(32) M. b. A. al-Kansūsī, *al-Jaysh al-ʿaramram al-khumāsī fī dawlat Mawlānā ʿAlī al-Sijilmāsī*, Marrakesh, al-Maṭbaʿa wa-l-Warrāqa al-Waṭaniyya, 1994, vol. I, pp. 6-7.

The argumentation is not very original – the aim is to uncover forgeries, which can be used to various ends, in this case social and religious in nature (it is quite typical that this account is joined with another, similar one, concerning the Jews of Fes, as cited by al-Kansūsī and al-Nāṣirī). As it was mentioned before, in more modern times, this *khobar* was especially popular among the Maghreb authors. It is important to mention that it appeared solely in theoretical and methodological introductions to their historiographies⁽³³⁾, but not in the narrations relating events of the Prophet's times or the 'Abbasid caliph, al-Qā'im.

The most important aspect of the history of this *khobar* is the time when it transformed from the original version by Hilāl al-Ṣābi' into the one that survived with minor alterations to the 19th century. It seems that, in the 14th century, the account could still appear in various versions, one of which was the one related by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. It appeared for the first time in al-Ṣafadī's text alongside another version, known by Ibn Kathīr, where he relates it for the last time. Therefore it can be assumed that the version which survived through the subsequent iterations until the 19th century was formed at that time. What occurred here was a sort of "erasure of text memory" – not of its contents, but the circumstances in which it appeared – the wider context of the account was forgotten, although the earliest historical context was preserved – therefore, one must approach the *khobar* from two different viewpoints – obscurity and memory.

One may wonder about the reasons for such history of the *khobar*. For preservation of memory, the vital aspect is the main message of the account – which is the forgery committed by the Khaybar Jews. Although the structure of the context is preserved, the context itself was erased, possibly deliberately, or forgotten. The most probable hypothesis is that the transformations of the context were influenced by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's authority, as he was a far more prominent figure than the 'Abbasid visier, Ibn al-Furāt, an interesting individual, but less important for Arab cultural history than the author of the monumental *History of Baghdad*. Another interesting aspect, appearing only in

(33) É. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens...*, op. cit., pp. 26-27; the author also mentions the work by Ibn al-Muwaqqit (1866?-1949) *al-Sa'ada al-abadiyya*. The most recent edition of the work (Marrakesh, Mu'assasat Āfāq li-l-Dirāsāt wa-l-Nashr wa-l-Ittiṣāl, 2011) does not contain such text.

al-Zayyānī's record, is the emphasis on al-Khaṭīb's knowledge, which surpasses that of other Muslim scholars of that time. It also seems important that al-Khaṭīb was a historian, and who else, but a historian should appear in a text that argues over the value of historical research? Of course, it cannot be completely ruled out that there was a reverse process. The account itself was very useful for historiography authors, so they chose to rely on the authority of a historian, not a politician.

I deliberately chose not to focus on the problem of Muslim-Jewish relations in the early age of Islam, described in the *khobar*, as it would be more fitting for a separate dissertation. The important aspect was the manner in which the text survived and the details of its internal transformation and the context in which it appeared in the subsequent historiographies over a thousand years. One can only suspect that originally this was only one of many versions of this account, however – for reasons that are difficult to determine – it was the one that became most popular and survived until the end of the 19th century, which is the time when the *khobar* history ends its long lifespan. Only this version survived in the memory of other texts. One should emphasise here that the *historical memory of a text* operates on several levels – the first is the *internal memory* of the *khobar* itself, which in this case preserves its autonomous value and its original historical or quasi-historical connections (the proper account of the Jews). The second level is the *khobar* as a whole – together with its later context. Another level is the *khobar* with the context viewed as a part of the work where it is quoted. And finally the historiographical work – whether *Kitāb al-wuzarā'* or *Kitāb al-istiḳṣā'* – is a significant part of the semantic space (semiosphere – if one were to use Lotman's words) which is connected with cultural memory in various ways and which can be regarded as the last level of textual memory (of the *khobar*), when the text is deprived of its autonomy and dissipates into the collective memory.

The above investigations into the changes in the *khobar* about Khaybar Jews bring forth more questions – concerning the *objectivity* of the account or its *impartiality*⁽³⁴⁾. These questions are obviously quite tempting and disturb the researcher. It seems however, they can only be answered within a wider

(34) Compare: J. Le Goff, *History and Memory*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1992, pp. 111-115.

historical context. A short account, whose almost all versions have been presented above, cannot answer these questions. It is however, a voice in the discussion on the nature of Arab historiography and Arab historical reasoning. It is unknown which version of the events is true, but it is also possible that it does not matter. Maybe these are different ways of viewing a single event, as Muhammad ʿĀbid al-Jābirī would probably describe it?⁽³⁵⁾ Such treatment would be the consequence of the Arab-Muslim legal approach, known as *ikhtilāf*⁽³⁶⁾, a term that is difficult to translate explicitly – possibly a *disagreement*? *Ikhtilāf*, the example of which is the (co)existence of various Islamic law schools, did not have to cause a split and remained a constant feature of Sharia law, although it did not always benefit the world of Islam.

(35) M. A. al-Jābirī, *Madkhal ilā l-Qurʿān al-Karīm. Al-Juzʿ al-awwal fī l-taʿrif bi-l-Qurʿān*, Casablanca, Dār al-Nashr al-Maghribiyya, 2006, p. 18.

(36) Compare: J. Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975, pp. 95-97; *al-Mawsūʿa al-fiqhiyya*, Kuwait, 1993, vol. II, pp. 291-313.