

al-thālith ‘ashar, a three-volume biographical dictionary of the thirteenth *hijrī* century (1785–1882), which was edited and published posthumously by his grandson the Salafī scholar Muḥammad Bahjat al-Bīṭār. ‘Abd al-Razzāq began collecting the material early in his life, and the original manuscript contained a considerable amount of material of legendary character, which the editor partly deleted. In the later parts of the work the beginnings of a more critical attitude are discernible. Besides the biographies, it also includes occasional comments on important events in the history of Damascus, including the Egyptian occupation of 1832–40, and the anti-Christian riots of 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Bīṭār, *Hilyat al-bashar fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar*, 3 vols., Damascus 1961–3; Muḥammad Bahjat al-Bīṭār, *Tarjamat al-Shaykh ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Bīṭār, al-Manār* 21 (1919), 317–24; Anwar al-Jundī, *A‘lām al-adab wa-l-fann* (Damascus 1954–8), 1:220–2; Muḥammad Muṭī‘ al-Ḥāfīz and Nizār Abāza, *Tārikh ‘ulamā’ Dīmashq fī l-qarn al-rābi‘ ‘ashar al-hijrī* (Damascus 1986–91), 1:340–3; David Dean Commins, *Islamic reform. Politics and social change in late Ottoman Syria*, Oxford 1990; Itzchak Weismann, *Taste of modernity. Sufism, Salafīyya, and Arabism in late Ottoman Damascus*, Leiden 2001; Itzchak Weismann, *Between Sufi reformism and modernist rationalism—A reappraisal of the origins of the Salafīyya from the Damascene angle*, *WI* 41 (2001), 206–37.

ITZCHAK WEISMANN

Budayl b. Warqā²

Budayl b. Warqā² al-Khuzā‘ī, an early convert to Islam, belonged to the clan of ‘Adī b. ‘Amr of the Khuzā‘a. He lived in Mecca, and his *dār* was situated in the quarters of the confederates

of the Qurashī clan of Sahn (al-Azraqī, 475). In one report he is identified as a *maulā* (client) of al-‘Āṣ b. Wā’il al-Sahmī (al-Samarqandī, 1:465, on Q 5:106). Budayl is referred to in the sources as one of the chiefs of his tribe and as the shrewdest among the Arabs and one of the noblest among those who converted to Islam in the year of the conquest of Mecca (8/630) (*min kibār muslimat al-fath*). In the same year, he fought with the Prophet in the battle of Ḥunayn and the subsequent taking of al-Ṭā‘if, following which he was put in charge of the prisoners of the defeated Hawāzin. Later, he summoned, at Muḥammad’s behest, members of the Khuzā‘a (of the Banū Ka‘b branch) to join the Muslim army in the battle of Tabūk (9/630). His family used to boast of a letter addressed to him and other leaders of the Khuzā‘a, in which the Prophet invited them to embrace Islam and be favoured with the rank of muḥājir. According to al-Wāqidī, the letter was sent in Jumādā II 8/September–October 630, a few months before the conquest of Mecca (al-Wāqidī, 749–50). Budayl’s son ‘Abdallāh—and, according to some reports, also his son ‘Abd al-Raḥmān or his son Muḥammad—was a partisan of ‘Alī and was killed in the battle of Ṣiffīn (37/657).

Budayl is associated above all with the events that brought about the treaty of al-Ḥudaybiyya (6/628), which in turn paved the way for the conquest of Mecca. Before al-Ḥudaybiyya, Budayl reportedly came from Mecca to Muḥammad’s camp with some men of the Khuzā‘a and informed him that the Quraysh were determined to fight Muḥammad if the latter insisted on entering their city. The Khuzā‘a, both Muslims and polytheists, were confidants of Muḥammad and kept him informed of everything happening in Mecca. Upon hearing Budayl’s report the

Prophet sent with him a nonbelligerent verbal message for the Quraysh, but they received it with suspicion.

Almost two years after the conclusion of the Ḥudaybiyya treaty, members of the Khuzā'a (the Banū Ka'b), who had joined the truce on Muḥammad's side, were attacked at night near one of their wells (al-Watīr) by the Banū l-Dīl, a tribe of the Banū Bakr of the Kināna, who had entered the truce as confederates of the Quraysh. The latter supplied the Banū Bakr with weapons. Budayl is said to have been one of two persons in whose *dār* the Khuzā'a took refuge, after being attacked by the Banū Bakr. The latter reportedly besieged the Khuzā'a in Budayl's *dār* for three days. Later, Budayl reportedly came with some members of the Khuzā'a to Muḥammad in Medina and told him about the attack and how the Quraysh had helped the Banū Bakr against the Khuzā'a. This constituted a breach of the Ḥudaybiyya treaty and gave Muḥammad cause for war on the Quraysh. On his return to Mecca, Budayl is said to have met Abū Sufyān, who had set out from Mecca in order to meet Muḥammad in Medina and prevent the latter's punitive attack on Mecca. Budayl did not tell him about his meeting with Muḥammad. Later, when Muḥammad and his army had set out towards Mecca, Budayl is mentioned again, this time as being among some leaders of Mecca, including Abū Sufyān, who went in search of news because they were ignorant of Muḥammad's intentions. The sources also describe a subsequent meeting of Abū Sufyān, Budayl, and others, with Muḥammad in his camp at Marr al-Zahrān, during which Budayl embraced Islam, while Abū Sufyān was still reluctant to do so. Eventually Abū Sufyān, too, pledged allegiance to Muḥammad, and the

Prophet reportedly sent Abū Sufyān and the others back to Mecca and proclaimed that any who entered Abū Sufyān's *dār* would be safe. Some versions add that protection was also granted to those who entered Budayl's *dār*.

These versions in which Budayl is associated with the events that led to the treaty of Ḥudaybiyya and then to the peaceful surrender of Mecca—other versions of the same events do not mention him—help glorify his name; in the less current traditions, on the contrary, his pagan orientation is still apparent. In these traditions he and some other idolaters among the Khuzā'a scorn the Muslims for refusing to eat meat that was not slaughtered according to Muḥammad's injunctions (al-Zamakhsharī, 3:21, on Q 22:67), which reminds one that the Khuzā'a were the tribe of 'Amr b. Luḥayy, whom the sources hold responsible for the introduction of idolatry to Mecca. This claim is counterbalanced, however, by traditions linking Budayl to lawful Islamic sacrificial slaughter. He is said to have been requested by Muḥammad (during the Farewell pilgrimage) to proclaim that the days of Minā (i.e., the *īd al-adḥā*) were meant for eating and drinking and not for fasting.

The exact date of Budayl's death is not given in the sources, but its circumstances are related in commentaries on Q 5:106–8. This passage permits Muslims dying on the road to entrust their belongings to two of their travelling companions, even if they are non-Muslims. Some traditions name Budayl as a Muslim who died while on a journey and identify the two Christians who accompanied him and to whom Budayl entrusted his belongings as Tamīm al-Dārī and 'Adī b. Zayd (al-Samarqandī, 1:465, on Q 5:106).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abū l-Walīd al-Azraqī, *Akhhār Makka*, in Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (ed.), *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka* (Göttingen 1859, repr. Beirut n.d.), 1:475; Yūsuf b. ‘Abdallāh Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *al-Istī‘āb fī ma‘rifat al-aṣḥāb*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī (Cairo 1960), 1:150; Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣāba fī ma‘rifat al-ṣahāba*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī (Cairo 1970), 1:275–7; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansāb al-‘arab*, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn (Cairo 1962), 239; Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and ‘Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī (repr. Beirut 1971), 3:325–6, 4:37–8, 42; Ibn al-Kalbī, *Nasab Ma‘add wa-l-Yaman al-kabīr*, ed. Nājī Ḥasan (Beirut 1988), 2:453; Ibn Manzūr, *Mukhtaṣar Ta‘rīkh Dimashq li-Ibn ‘Asākir*, ed. Rūḥiyya al-Nahḥās, Riyāḍ ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Murād, and Muḥammad Muṭī‘ al-Ḥafīz (Damascus 1984–8), 7:237; Ibn Sad, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt* (Beirut 1960), 2:96, 4:294; Abū l-Layth al-Samarqandī, *Tafsīr*, ed. ‘Alī Mu‘awwad, ‘Adil Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Mawjūd, and Zakariyyā ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Nawuī, 3 vols., Beirut 1993; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta‘rīkh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje et al. (Leiden 1879–1901), 1:1534–5, 1619–28, 1634–5; al-Wāqīdī, *Kitāb al-maghāzī*, ed. Marsden Jones (London 1966), 2:593–4, 782–4, 749–50, 814–5, 3:923, 990; W. Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad at Medina* (Oxford 1956), 355–6 (the letter to Budaʿy); al-Zamaksharī, *al-Kashshāf ‘an ḥaqā’iq al-tanzīl*, 4 vols., Cairo 1966–8.

URI RUBIN

al-Būṣīrī

Al-Būṣīrī, Sharaf al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd b. Ḥammād al-Ṣanhājī (died between 694 and 696/1294 and 1297), was a celebrated Egyptian poet of the Mamlūk period. Of Berber ancestry, he was born on 1 Shawwāl 608/7 March 1212 in either Būṣīr or Dalās, in Upper Egypt, and died in Cairo. One of his contemporaries described him as “short in stature, but of great nobility.” As a young man, al-Būṣīrī appears to have

studied Arabic and the religious sciences in Cairo. He also followed the teachings of the Ṣūfī Abū l-‘Abbās Aḥmad al-Mursī (d. 686/1287) and the Shādhiliyya order. He settled for a time in Bilbays, where he was a secretary and scribe; he eventually held a minor administrative position. Al-Būṣīrī died in Cairo, and was buried near the tomb of al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820), in the Qarāfa cemetery.

Al-Būṣīrī was esteemed as a fine poet by many of his contemporaries, and his poems were collected in his *ḍiwan*, which has been edited and published. This work contains over fifty poems employing a range of rhymes and metres, as well as using various literary devices (*badī‘*) in skilful wordplay. The influence of earlier poets, particularly the Egyptian Ṣūfī poet Ibn al-Fāriḍ (d. 632/1235), is apparent in several poems. Al-Būṣīrī addressed a number of themes in his verse, generally involving praise, humour, or invective. In one poem, he declared that he served as an administrator only to support his family, and then proceeded to deliver a scathing critique of minor bureaucrats, particularly Christians and Jews who, he claimed, acted rapaciously in order to support their opulent lifestyles, replete with wine and fine clothes. Al-Būṣīrī also harshly criticised the beliefs and practices of Jews and Christians in other verse, but Muslims, too, felt the sting of this misanthrope, so that, according to the historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), many people loathed the poet and his sharp tongue. In line with his invectives, al-Būṣīrī often depicted himself as penniless and henpecked, with hungry children to feed and a nagging wife who gave him little respect. Unsurprisingly, he directed such poems to prospective patrons among the Mamlūk ruling elite. While he often praised Mamlūk officials, he also extolled the virtues of the spiritual